

APR 17 1945

Volume LX

Number 4

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ALBRECHT, W. P.— <i>Hazlitt and Malthus</i> ,	215
SANDERS, C. R.— <i>Lytton Strachey's Revisions in 'Books and Characters'</i> ,	226
CARRIÈRE, J.-M.— <i>Unnoticed Translations of Balzac in American Periodicals</i> ,	234
HILLMANN, SISTER MARY VINCENT.— <i>Some Debatable Words in 'Pearl'</i> and Its Theme,	241
BRESSIE, RAMONA.— <i>Modern Textual Corruption in MS Cambridge Additional 3470</i> ,	248
BENTLEY, NORMA E.—'Hudibras' Butler Abroad,	254
CASE, A. E.—Swift and Sir William Temple—a Conjecture,	259
AMES, A. C.—Early Criticism of Pope's "Night-Piece,"	265
SCHMITZ, R. M.—Dr. Johnson and Blair's Sermons,	268
THAYER, MARY REBECCA.—Keats and Coleridge: "La Belle Dame sans Merci,"	270
WILEY, A. N.—Wordsworth's "Travelling Cripple,"	272
DAVIS, KATHRYN.—A Note on the 'Spectator 459,'	274
 REVIEWS:—	
J. D. BENNETT, <i>Baudelaire: A Criticism</i> . [Margaret Gilman]	274
E. P. SHAW, <i>Jacques Cazotte (1719-1792)</i> . [G. R. Havens]	276
RUTH WHITTREDGE (ed.), <i>La Nativité et La Géa des Trois Roys</i> . [Raphael Levy.]	277
H. H. ADAMS, <i>English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642</i> . [Willard Farnham.]	278
F. E. MINERKA, <i>The Dissidence of Dissent: The Monthly Repository, 1806-1838</i> . [Miriam M. H. Thrall.]	280
F. A. LEA, <i>Carlyle: Prophet of To-Day</i> . [C. F. Harrold.]	281
BRIEF MENTION: H. H. CLARKE (ed.), <i>Thomas Paine: Representative Selections; French Learned Journals</i> ,	283
CORRESPONDENCE: Tennyson and Persian Poetry Once More; Anglo-Latin Busones,	284

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18, MD.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feiss, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MP*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RR*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

THE MIND OF A POET

A STUDY OF WORDSWORTH'S THOUGHT
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO

THE PRELUDE

By RAYMOND D. HAVENS

Fifteen years have gone into this search for the hiding places of a poet's power. There are chapters on the part matter-of-factness, passion, fear, wonder, solitude, silence, and loneliness, animism, nature, anti-rationalism, the mystic experience, religion, and imagination played in the thought and poetry of Wordsworth. Other topics are considered more briefly and *The Prelude*, the most illuminating account in English of the mind of a poet, is examined in detail. Theory has not been imposed on poetry but Wordsworth's beliefs have been deduced and explained from what he himself wrote and said.

xviii + 670 pages, two maps, buckram. \$5.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1108.
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

ors
the
cript
cles
th
of
uo-
not
P.,
ors
ens

re
ne
pt
es
p
of
o
ot
>
re
is

Modern Language Notes

Volume XL

APRIL, 1945

Number 4

HAZLITT AND MALTHUS

For William Hazlitt the *Essay on Population* was a symbol of oppression. As a means of discouraging imprudent marriages, Malthus had proposed the withdrawal of poor relief; and Malthus's principle of population, or frequently some perversion of it, had been cited in support of similar measures that Hazlitt thought unjust to the poor. In his *Reply to the Essay on Population*,¹ therefore, Hazlitt attacked both author and principle, as well as the perversions, in order to weaken Malthus's political influence.

Comment on the *Reply*, although generally more favorable than not, has been slight. Hazlitt himself thought well enough of his arguments against Malthus to repeat them throughout his political essays² and to defend their originality at least twice;³ but although the *Reply* has been recognized as "a serious contribution to the

¹ A *Reply to the Essay on Population by the Reverend T. R. Malthus*, *Complete Works*, ed. P. P. Howe (London, 1930-34), I, 177-364. All references to *Works* in this article are to this edition. Published anonymously in 1807 in one 8vo volume, the *Reply* comprises five "letters" and a series of "extracts" from the *Essay* with "notes." The first three letters appeared originally in Cobbett's *Weekly Political Register*, March 14, 1807; May 16, 1807; and May 23, 1807.

² *Political Essays*, *Works*, VII, 113, 332-61, 408-10; *Literary and Political Criticism*, *Works*, XIX, 280-85, 299-301, 309; *The Spirit of the Age*, *Works*, XI, 103-14.

³ Letter to Leigh Hunt, April 21, 1821, quoted in Ford K. Brown, *The Life of William Godwin* (London, 1926), p. 334, n.; Letter published in the *London Magazine* for November, 1825, quoted in Thomas DeQuincey, "Malthus on Population," *Collected Writings*, ed. David Masson (London, 1897), IX, 20-22.

Malthusian controversy,"⁴ the nature of this contribution has been only suggested in scattered writings.⁵

Undoubtedly the length of the *Reply*, its repetitions, its contumely, and, most of all, its misrepresentations of Malthus's argument have caused it often to be ignored or underestimated.⁶ Caring less for "Mr. Malthus's nonsense" than for the "opinion of the world respecting it,"⁷ Hazlitt attacked Malthus and his followers indiscriminately, often identifying false and even absurd inferences from the *Essay* with Malthus's meaning and intent. To examine these inferences and their political force is to give relevance to parts of the *Reply* that in relation to the *Essay* alone may seem obtuse or wilfully perverse. Yet Hazlitt's contribution to the Malthusian controversy goes beyond refuting "the opinion of the world"; for his interest in the practical effects of the *Essay* led him to anticipate, more fully than other early critics, the adaptation of Malthus's principle that has been made to explain population phenomena since Malthus's time.

I.

Malthus's first edition (1798) is a reply to Godwin's *Political Justice*. Since "the power of population is indefinitely greater

⁴ Alfred Cobban, "William Hazlitt," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. Edwin R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson, VII (1932), 286. Cf. James A. Field, "The Malthusian Controversy in England," *Essays on Population*, ed. H. F. Hohman (Chicago, 1931), p. 41; Crane Brinton, *The Political Ideas of the English Romantics* (London, 1926), p. 133.

⁵ Probably the most detailed treatment of the *Reply* printed heretofore is Catherine Macdonald Maclean's analysis in *Born under Saturn* (New York, 1944), pp. 225-32. The *Reply*, Miss Maclean points out, is directed against the practical effects of the *Essay*, rather than Malthus's speculation, and against the "vulgar selfishness" which the *Essay* seemed to typify and encourage. Seeking an "understanding of [Hazlitt's] character" in the *Reply*, she shows that it was Hazlitt's devotion to liberty that led him to oppose Malthus; but with "Malthus's theories as such" she has "no concern," nor does she mention Hazlitt's counter-theories.

⁶ Dr. James Bonar (*Malthus and His Work* [2d ed.; London, 1924], pp. 85, 372, 394) dismisses Hazlitt as one of the critics who "say the doctrine of the essay is a truism." Cf. Dr. Bonar's Foreword to Field, *op. cit.*, p. viii. Professor Norman Himes, in the introduction to his edition of Francis Place's *Illustrations and Proofs of the Principle of Population* (Boston, 1930), speaks disparagingly of the length of the *Reply* but attempts no further evaluation. (Introduction, pp. 35, 57-58.)

⁷ *Reply*, p. 203.

than the power in the earth to produce subsistence for man," Malthus deduces "a strong and constantly operating check on population from the difficulty of subsistence."⁸ This check is evident in "vice and misery"—conditions antithetical to the "morality and happiness" that Godwin expected to follow political justice.⁹ Beyond the influence of government, Malthus concludes, population pressure will always exist and will always result in vicious sexual practices, selfish competition for goods, crime, and privation.¹⁰ In his second edition (1803) Malthus shifted his attack from Godwin to the Poor Laws. Although the first *Essay* classifies the preventive checks as vice or misery, the second *Essay* includes a third check—"moral restraint," or the postponement of marriage until one is able to support a large family and, in the meantime, the practice of "strict chastity."¹¹ Malthus did not foresee "any great change in the conduct of men on this subject" and therefore not any great diminution of poverty; but, he believed, if the poor could not count on relief and if they were taught their responsibility for poverty, they would work harder, produce more food, have fewer children, and, consequently, attain an appreciably higher standard of living.¹²

The pessimism and selfishness fostered by the *Essay* seemed, to Hazlitt, inimical to any improvement whatsoever.¹³ Answering the "opinion of the world" as well as Malthus, Hazlitt argues that (1) since, in some of their forms, vice and misery can be traced to other causes than the lack of food and since these causes are removable, (2) since the insufficiency of food may be remedied by producing more food and distributing it more equitably, and (3) since a reduction in the vice and misery resulting from both lack

⁸ Thomas Robert Malthus, *First Essay on Population* 1798 (London, 1926), pp. 13-26.

⁹ Cf. T. R. Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population; or, a View of Its Past and Present Effects on Human Happiness; with an Inquiry into Our Prospects Respecting the Future Removal or Mitigation of the Evils Which It Occasions* ([2d ed.]; London, 1803), Bk. I, chap. ii, pp. 11-12, n.; and William Godwin, *Political Justice* (London, 1793), Bk. I, chaps. iv-vi; Bk. II, chaps. ii-iii, vi; and *passim*.

¹⁰ *First Essay*, pp. 185-90.

¹¹ *Essay* (2d ed.), Bk. IV, chap. ii, pp. 495-96.

¹² *Ibid.*, chap. iii, pp. 504, 507; chap. vii, p. 538; and *passim*.

¹³ *Reply*, pp. 181-82. Cf. "What Is the People?" *Political Essays*, p. 270; "William Godwin," *The Spirit of the Age*, pp. 21-22.

of food and other causes will at the same time encourage the prudential check—since as experience shows, all these propositions are true, vice and misery are not (1) unavoidable or (2) expedient to prevent overpopulation.¹⁴

This argument, like most of the objections to the *Essay* written during the twenty or twenty-five years following its publication, premises that, according to Malthus, (1) the amount of food and its distribution are determined by "nature" rather than human "institutions," (2) all forms of suffering or immorality spring from the disparate rates at which population and subsistence are supposed to increase, (3) any increase in population is therefore undesirable, and (4) vice and misery are expedient to keep population within safe limits. These propositions are not found in the *Essay*.

The Poor Laws, in fact, are an "institution" condemned as reducing total as well as relative subsistence; and the "institutions" of marriage and private property, because they make every man responsible for supporting his own children, appear as the "natural and obvious" means of increasing subsistence.¹⁵ To be sure, Malthus minimizes the power of the ruling classes to help the poor, and stresses the role of the laboring class in bringing about a favorable proportion between their numbers and the wages fund, or the "aggregate quantity of food possessed by owners of land beyond their own consumption."¹⁶ This fund, Hazlitt objects, is fixed not by the "laws of nature" but by the interest of employers, so that labor can obtain an adequate share only through

¹⁴ To diminish the *Essay's* influence, Hazlitt also charged Malthus with plagiarism, although Malthus had adequately acknowledged his debt to Robert Wallace's *Various Prospects of Mankind, Nature, and Providence* (1761). (*Reply*, pp. 189-90; *First Essay*, p. 8; *Essay* [2d ed.], Preface, p. iii.)

¹⁵ *First Essay*, pp. 189-98. When Malthus writes, ". . . Though human institutions appear to be the obvious and obtrusive causes of much mischief to mankind, they are, in reality, light and superficial, in comparision with those deeper-seated causes of evil which result from the laws of nature," he is not, as the passage quoted out of its context suggests, denying the effect of institutions on subsistence but referring particularly to property and marriage, the evils resulting from which are shown to be light in comparison with those which they avert. (*Essay* [2d ed.], Bk. III, chap. ii, pp. 367 ff. Cf. *Reply*, p. 244.)

¹⁶ *First Essay*, p. 203.

the right to strike,¹⁷ a right which had been denied by the Combination Laws of 1799 and 1800. But Malthus, too, although he suggests no means of limiting the employers' power, regrets that "combination among the rich" drives wages below their "natural" level.¹⁸ Similarly, he agrees with his critics that other institutions alter the degree of poverty,¹⁹ maintaining only that regardless of the amount of food produced or allotted as wages, population will always so increase that some members of the laboring class must endure poverty and even actual want.²⁰

Furthermore, Malthus acknowledges "immediate" checks "independent of . . . scarcity," subsistence being "necessary" only as an "ultimate" check to population.²¹ For however complete the utilization of the world's resources may be, the biologically possible increase of population cannot permanently be realized; and at any time, whatever the immediate checks may be, the capacity for producing food is the ultimate limiting factor. The greater the productive capacity diverted from producing food to creating other goods, the higher the standard of living, but the smaller the population.²² Between population, then, and want of food Malthus wished to interpose a barrier or cushion in the form of a higher standard of living, and to this end proposed getting rid of the Poor Laws. The *Essay* does not oppose populousness *per se* but distinguishes between what seemed to Malthus the desirable and the undesirable means of encouraging population: that is, between (1) increasing production and income through "free" competition among both laborers and capitalists and (2) methods, like charity, regulation of wages, or common ownership, which, he thought, would increase population without increasing subsistence proportionally.²³ The fear of vice and misery, therefore, might be considered expedient as a means of checking population; but Malthus denies the expediency of these checks themselves, and in

¹⁷ *Reply*, pp. 312-13, 331-33.

¹⁸ *First Essay*, pp. 35-36.

¹⁹ Malthus, *Essay* (5th ed.; London, 1817), Vol. II, Bk. III, chaps. viii-x.

²⁰ *First Essay*, pp. 252-54, 277.

²¹ Malthus, *Essay* (3d ed.; London, 1806), Vol. I, Bk. I, chap. ii, p. 15.

²² Cf. Henry Pratt Fairchild, *People, The Quantity and Quality of Population* (New York, 1939), pp. 134-35.

²³ *Essay* (2d ed.), Bk. III, chap. xi, pp. 470 ff.; Bk. IV, chap. iii, pp. 509-10. Cf. *Essay* (5th ed.), Vol. III, Bk. III, chap. xiv, pp. 28-34.

his second edition, which Hazlitt frequently quotes, he expresses his "mortification" that it should have been inferred from the *Essay*.²⁴

There is, nevertheless, sufficient evidence that the inferences attacked by Hazlitt were basic in arguments affecting legislation. ". . . Political writers of every class," according to a contemporary critic, attributed "the most ridiculous . . . effects to the new subsistence principle. In their theoretic fury, they seemed to consider all the evils of human nature as springing from the increase of population."²⁵ Malthus's statement that "population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio," whereas "subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio,"²⁶ led to the fear of any increase in either population or subsistence. If population should double, Hazlitt points out, it was thought that subsistence could increase only fifty percent; or, if subsistence should be tripled, population would be raised to the third power, the repressive action of vice and misery becoming, in the meantime, catastrophic.²⁷ Other hostile critics testify to this fear,²⁸ and the *Quarterly*, in a review favorable to Malthus, agrees that each ratio was often, though erroneously, thought to be "a philosophical maxim no less indisputable than the principle of motion or gravitation, or any of the ascertained and unerring laws of nature." The difference between the ratios, measured in numbers of people, was considered as "natural" or "necessary" [meaning "inevitable"], so that vice and misery were also thought "necessary" [meaning, often, not only "inevitable" but "expedient"] "to reconcile them and bring them to a level."²⁹

Effects of the *Essay* may be noted as early as 1800. At that time Pitt dropped his Poor Bill, which had proposed supplement-

²⁴ *Essay* (2d ed.), Bk. III, chap. iii, p. 381.

²⁵ [Simon Gray, under pseudonym of] George Purves, *Gray versus Malthus, the Principles of Population and Production Investigated* (London, 1818), p. iii.

²⁶ *First Essay*, p. 14.

²⁷ *Reply*, pp. 219-22.

²⁸ Cf. William Godwin, *Of Population* (London, 1820), pp. 135, 237, 300, and *passim*; George Ensor, *An Inquiry Concerning the Population of Nations* (London, 1818), p. 12; Charles Hall, *The Effects of Civilization* (2d ed.; London, 1813), pp. 325-26.

²⁹ "Malthus on Population," *Quarterly Review*, xvii (July, 1817), 378.

ing wages out of the poor rates, because of objections "by those whose opinions he was bound to respect."³⁰ In 1807 Whitbread's Poor Bill, which first directed Hazlitt's wrath against Malthus, had cited the principle of population as reason for giving the wealthy more power in administering the poor rates,³¹ but the bill was not voted on. Wartime prosperity apparently deterred the ruling classes from pressing the charge that the Poor Laws had created a redundant population. In 1816 and 1817, however, Robert Owen reports "an outcry and great alarm created by the Malthusians, who asserted that . . . the sufferings of the poor and the want of employment . . . arose from an excess of population."³² The Committee of the House of Commons on Poor Laws refused Owen a hearing for his Villages of Co-operation partly, at least, because the members feared that, as the proposed villages extended the cultivation of the soil, population would increase disproportionately.³³ Sir Egerton Brydges, a member of the Committee, testifies that among the objections "(felt, rather than clearly expressed), to the employment of the Poor on waste lands, was the fear to hasten overstepping [of the limits of production]."³⁴ After 1816, apparently, as suggested by the Poor Bills of 1818 and 1819 and by the fate of Poor-Law legislation proposed to the Committee or introduced into Parliament,³⁵ the interest of the ruling class was in curtailing relief, and mistaken inferences from the *Essay*, as well as more accurate ones,³⁶ were used to support this interest.

³⁰ Hansard, *Parliamentary History*, XXXIV (1800), 1428-29. The rest of the passage suggests that Pitt was referring to Bentham and Malthus. Cf. [William Empson], "The Life, Writings, and Character of Mr. Malthus," *Edinburgh Review*, LXIV (January, 1837), 483.

³¹ Samuel Whitbread, *Substance of a Speech on the Poor Laws* (London, 1807), pp. 54-57.

³² Robert Owen, *The Life of Robert Owen by Himself* (New York, 1920), p. 201. Cf. pp. 266, 290.

³³ Robert Owen, "Letter Published . . . July 30th, 1817," *A Supplementary Appendix to the First Volume of the Life of Robert Owen* (London, 1858), pp. 74-75.

³⁴ Sir Egerton Brydges, *The Population and Riches of Nations* (Paris and London, 1819), pp. 81-82.

³⁵ Sir George Nicholls, *A History of the English Poor Law* (London, 1854), II, 192-200; William Smart, *Economic Annals of the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1910), I, 638-40, 705-07.

³⁶ Cf. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, XXXIII (1816), 1115.

II.

Although identifying popular misconceptions with Malthus's thesis, Hazlitt, unlike many critics, understood that population pressure results from disparity between *actual* subsistence and the *power* of population to increase.³⁷ But he wished to show (1) that this pressure is not proportional to total population, (2) that increased income would not, therefore, aggravate poverty, and (3) that prudence among the poor must begin with an adequate return for their labor. More clearly than Malthus, therefore, he correlates the prudential check with "improvement." "Excess" population, translated into a certain amount of privation, is limited at the point where people, responding to the "difficulty of providing for . . . a family," refrain from marriage or sexual intercourse in order to maintain a standard of living.³⁸ This responsiveness does not depend, as Malthus indicates, on only a "calculation of consequences" but is increased by a greater command of goods, by consequent notions of "comfort and decency," and by "moral causes" such as the "manners," "habits and character" of the people.³⁹ Therefore, as long as employers control the wages fund, cutting off relief would depress and degrade the poor still further without making them more prudent.⁴⁰ On the other hand, extending cultivation would not overpopulate the earth: since population can increase only in "consequence of greater industry and knowledge," the actual increase "would . . . denote of itself, that people would be . . . less likely to involve themselves in wilful distress than before."⁴¹

Thus, writing in 1807, Hazlitt anticipated the usual adaptation of Malthus's principle made to explain the rising standard of living that was simultaneous with increasing population during the nineteenth century. Malthus, of course, was aware that "habits of

³⁷ Notes to *Political Essays, Works*, VII, 409-10.

³⁸ *Reply*, p. 231. Hazlitt does not, like Malthus, explicitly limit "moral restraint" to the postponement of marriage, but I have found no evidence that he uses the term to include contraception.

³⁹ *Reply*, pp. 281-82, 314, 360. Cf. *An Essay on the Principles of Human Action, Works*, I, 1 ff.; "A New View of Society," *Political Essays*, p. 103; "William Godwin," *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19; Brinton, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

⁴⁰ *Reply*, pp. 314, 329-33, 339, 360, and *passim*.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 208, 213, 225, and *passim*.

prudential restraint . . . most frequently arise from the custom of enjoying conveniences and comforts,"⁴² but, skeptical of any "great change" in the practice of such restraint and used to thinking of extended cultivation in terms of inferior soils,⁴³ he believed that "sudden cultivation" would improve the condition of the poor only for "a time,"⁴⁴ and even suggested that it would give such impetus to population that labor would "continue flowing into the market" after the means of supporting it had "essentially contracted."⁴⁵ But through improved transportation and manufacturing, which by 1850 "for practical purposes . . . more than doubled the area and resources of Europe,"⁴⁶ England enjoyed the equivalent of "sudden cultivation," and population, while increasing rapidly, did not increase rapidly enough to prevent a rise in real wages. This higher level of living has been usually explained⁴⁷ by the fact of a differential birth rate, the inference that it results from voluntary restraint on the higher economic levels, and the further inference that (1) conditions making for a higher level of living or (2) simply the attainment of that level enforces the preventive check. Looking back upon part of the period of expansion, John Stuart Mill explained the rising level of living much as Hazlitt had in anticipation. There is a "habitual standard . . . down to which [the labouring class] will multiply, but not lower," and every advance in "education, civilization, and social improvement" tends to raise the standard of comfort that people will not sacrifice for larger families.⁴⁸ The declining birth rate after 1870 has been

⁴² *Essay* (5th ed.), Vol. II, Bk. III, chap. viii, p. 392.

⁴³ *Essay* (3d ed.), Vol. I, Bk. I, chap. i, pp. 8, 11.

⁴⁴ *Essay* (2d ed.), Bk. III, chap. xi, p. 78.

⁴⁵ *Essay* (5th ed.), Vol. II, Bk. III, chap. iv, pp. 304-05.

⁴⁶ Warren S. Thompson, *Population Problems* (2d. ed.; New York, 1939), pp. 44-45.

⁴⁷ There are, of course, theories at variance with the Malthusian explanation of population growth and decline. Some Catholic writers reject Malthus's theory, even in modified form, as not proved or as incapable of proof. (Cf. Edward B. Reuter, *Population Problems* [2d ed. rev.; Chicago, 1937], p. 172.) Another theory is that reproductive power varies in cycles, the fall in the European birth rate in the nineteenth century being due, therefore, to a decline in human fertility. (Cf. Corrado Gini, "The Cyclical Rise and Fall of Population," *Population. Lectures on the Harris Foundation, 1929* [Chicago, 1930].)

⁴⁸ John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy* (London, 1923), I, 161, 190-93.

cited by modern writers as evidence that, when additional labor could no longer effect a proportional growth in income, people had recourse to the preventive check to maintain their higher standard of living.⁴⁹

According to this explanation, what Hazlitt calls the "responsiveness" of the prudential check to changed conditions seems to have increased, as he predicted, with greater income and the resulting increase in population. Increased income, however, is not enough in itself to raise the standard of living. The rate of increase may also be a factor. Since a larger population cannot immediately follow greater income, whereas improvement in the standard of living can take place almost immediately, the latter is more likely to benefit from the increased availability of goods, and, once established, a higher level of living resists downward pressure. But if resources are exploited gradually, time is allowed for population to grow up to the limit of increased income, leaving the standard of living unchanged.⁵⁰ There are, moreover, "non-material" factors, such as unhappy family life and antagonisms between social classes or nations, that may accompany greater income and a higher standard of living but tend to retard further increases in wealth and material well-being.⁵¹ But although we must qualify Hazlitt's theory that prudence in sexual relations and the standard of living are always functions of either income or population, a higher standard of living has been achieved as a result of greater income, and, contrary to Malthus's expectation, maintained at the expense of the birth rate; and the usual explanation of this phenomenon is the one offered by Hazlitt.

Most of the early critics, to challenge Malthus's arithmetical ratio, cite the possibility of increased food production and more equitable distribution; but to maintain a standard of living many relied not on any check but only on the "naturalness" of producing enough food to keep pace with population. Further opportunities for the division of labor, it was often thought, would

⁴⁹ Fairchild, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-39; Reuter, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-75, 213-14. The use of contraceptives probably was not a factor. Until dealing with very recent population phenomena, it is not necessary to distinguish between sexual desire and the desire for children. (Fairchild, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-30.)

⁵⁰ Fairchild, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-32.

⁵¹ Carle C. Zimmerman, *Consumption and Standards of Living* (New York, 1936), pp. 212-13.

increase productivity more rapidly than population could increase. Any "natural" disparity between population and subsistence and, therefore, any need for checking were supposed to be centuries away.⁵² The preventive check was deprecated as obstructing populousness and therefore improvement and, usually, as irreligious or immoral.⁵³ Forced to admit eventual population pressure, however, and noticing varying birth rates on different economic levels, some critics foresaw safety in physiological checks, in an inverse proportion between fertility and the standard of living.⁵⁴ Others were willing to sanction the preventive check as a last resort, but only when finally necessary.⁵⁵ Coleridge and Southey vaguely correlate "improvement" and "chastity," but "improvement" remains a general term—more rational and moral than economic—and the "chastity" seems to be something indefinitely postponable.⁵⁶ Godwin clearly correlates the prudential check and the standard of living, but infers only that his communal society of rational beings

⁵² James Anderson, *A Calm Investigation* (2d ed.; London, 1801); Ensor, *op. cit.*; Edward Gardner, *Reflections on the Evil Effects of an Increasing Population* (Glocester, 1800); James Grahame, *An Inquiry into the Principle of Population* (London, 1816); Gray, *op. cit.*; Hall, *op. cit.*; Robert Acklom Ingram, *Disquisitions on Population* (London, 1806); Shelley, *Proposals for an Association of . . . Philanthropists, The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Ingpen and Peck (London and New York, 1927-30), v, 226; John Weyland, *The Principles of Population and Production* (London, 1816); and Arthur Young, *The Question of Scarcity* (London, 1800).

⁵³ Ingram, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-6, 30-35, 100 ff., and *passim*; Jarrold, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-56, 245-52; Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 291-98, 382, 425; Weyland, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-66 and *passim*; Shelley, *A Philosophical View of Reform, Works*, VII, 33; Ensor, *op. cit.*, pp. 181, 195-96, 498.

⁵⁴ Jarrold, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-64; Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-31, 146-60, 283-89; Weyland, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-83, 107-08.

⁵⁵ Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 162; Ingram, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40; Ensor, *op. cit.*, p. 355; Hall, *op. cit.*, pp. 343-47.

⁵⁶ For Coleridge's marginalia in his copy of Malthus's second edition, see Bonar, *op. cit.*, pp. 371-74; George Reuben Potter, "Unpublished Marginalia in Coleridge's Copy of Malthus's *Essay on Population*," *PMLA*, LI (1936), 1061-68; and Kenneth Curry, "A Note on Coleridge's Copy of Malthus," *PMLA*, LIV (1939), 613-15. As Professor Curry points out, Coleridge had evidently been writing his comments for Southey's use. Cf. [Robert Southey], "Malthus's *Essay on Population*," *Annual Review*, II (1803), 297-98.

would not, therefore, be destroyed by over-population.⁵⁷ He does not conclude that increased responsiveness of the prudential check to changed conditions could improve the condition of the poor under a system of private property. Until England is ready for common ownership, he would depend largely on more extensive and intensive cultivation to provide for an unchecked population.⁵⁸ More fully than any of these writers, or probably any other critic writing during the first two decades of the controversy, Hazlitt understood the relationship between the standard of living and the preventive check and the possibility of improvement implicit in that relationship.

WILLIAM PRICE ALBRECHT

*United States Naval Air Station,
Bunker Hill, Indiana*

LYTTON STRACHEY'S REVISIONS IN *BOOKS AND CHARACTERS*

When the time comes to study thoroughly the development of Lytton Strachey's mind and style, considerable attention will doubtless be given to the revisions which he made in his original articles and reviews before republishing them in *Books and Characters*. Many of the originals appeared early, the earliest of all in September, 1904. Eight were in print before 1912, when Strachey published his first book, *Landmarks in French Literature*; only two date after *Eminent Victorians* (1918). Furthermore, the revisions made for *Books and Characters* were numerous and, at times, extensive and complex. The book was published in 1922, not long after *Queen Victoria* (1921). In the revisions, therefore, we find an opportunity to observe the changes which the mature Strachey made before republishing a fairly large body of his early work.

I have made a line-by-line collation of the essays in *Books and Characters* with their originals and give below a complete list of the variants. In another paper I intend to discuss at some length the nature and significance of the changes. A few general observations

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 526-28, 597-98; William Godwin, *Thoughts Occasioned by . . . Dr. Parr's Spital Sermon . . .* (London, 1801), pp. 72-73.

⁵⁸ *Of Population*, pp. 469, 497-98.

concerning them may, however, be noted here. Some are relatively unimportant changes such as corrections of typographical errors. Awkward and redundant phrases are likewise corrected. Other changes are made necessary by new facts or a new perspective brought by time. Still others are motivated by the desire to convert journalistic articles and reviews into literary essays. There are also rather important changes in phrasing and diction prompted by considerations of accuracy and good taste. Strachey does not overlook possibilities for improving the paragraphing; sometimes he breaks up a long paragraph; far more frequently he brings two paragraphs together to achieve the effect of mass and weight. Many of the revisions indicate clearly a desire for economy and restraint. Others may develop parallel constructions or add quotations and illustrations in order to achieve greater force and emphasis. When there is opportunity Strachey may also add information or even a puckish trick much in the manner of the mature biographical works.

What Strachey does not change is fully as significant as what he changes. Born in 1880, he already possessed an unusual sense of style in 1904 when he published the earliest essay in the book; he was able to write much then that would still seem good to him in 1922. But the revisions provide ample evidence that his skill and taste continued to develop with time. To study these revisions is to watch a talented and careful literary craftsman at work.

In the list below the variants are given in page-by-page sequence within essays; but the essays are arranged in the order of their first-publication dates rather than in the order which they have in *Books and Characters*. In republishing, Strachey placed at the end of each essay a date, sometimes erroneous, for the first publication. I give the correct date and the title of the periodical in which each essay first appeared. Page and line reference are to *Books and Characters*, referred to by the symbol *BC* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922), rather than to sources. Line references are approximate. Brackets enclose the earlier reading. The symbol > means *becomes*.

I. "Shakespeare's Final Period." *Independent Review*, III (September, 1904), 405-418. Erroneously dated 1906 on page 69 of *BC*.

P. 51, l. 1: [“of modern Shakespearian criticism”] > “of the modern criticism of Shakespeare.”

P. 52, l. 12: omits everything in brackets: “deeply absorbed in the

awful problems of human existence. [Mr. Sidney Lee has, indeed, drawn an exactly opposite conclusion; for the only inference he feels justified in making from the facts before him is, that Shakespeare was so extraordinarily stupid that he never discovered how clever he really was. But this theory demands as much pure faith as the other, and has the additional disadvantage of commanding itself less to common sense.] It is not, however."

P. 52, l. 13: ["paper"] > "essay."

P. 53, l. 14: ["Even Mr. Sidney Lee"] > "Sir Sidney Lee, too."

P. 53, l. 18: combines a paragraph which began "Now it is clear" with the preceding paragraph. So with the paragraphs which began: "Racine's way is different," on p. 17, l. 12; "The truth is," p. 38, l. 6; "Such were the cruel maxims," p. 150, l. 18; "The present edition, however," p. 220, l. 18; "We wonder very much," p. 227, l. 6; "It is easy to imagine," p. 230, l. 12; "What dark and terrible visions," p. 232, l. 7; and "And sometimes Blake invests," p. 232, l. 18. On the other hand, Strachey breaks up paragraphs by starting new ones with "There is something inexplicable," p. 3, l. 20; "But what is it," p. 16, l. 15; "It is particularly," p. 17, l. 18; "But, as a rule, Racine's," p. 24, l. 20; "Apparently it did not occur," p. 195, l. 15; and "It would be vain," p. 259, l. 9.

P. 56, l. 8: ["Professor Raleigh's"] > "Sir Walter Raleigh's." So pp. 224, l. 12; 225, l. 6; 226, l. 11; 227, l. 6; 231, l. 9. P. 226, l. 23: ["Professor Raleigh"] > "Sir Walter."

P. 57, l. 16: ["'Italian friend'"] > "'Italian fiend.'"

P. 59, l. 10, to p. 60, l. 17: rewrites, filling in the quotations from Shakespeare and expanding the original passage, which read: ["are entirely of a piece with the grossnesses of *The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline*. Let the reader cast his eye over the soliloquy which Posthumus delivers when he hears of Imogen's guilt (*Cymbeline*, Act II, Scene 3), or the words of Leontes, half spoken in horrid irony to the child Mamillius (*Winter's Tale*, Act I, Scene 2); let him examine these passages, and let him reconcile them, if he can, with Professor Dowden's dictum: 'In these latest plays the beautiful pathetic light is always present.'

"But how has it happened"].

II. "Voltaire's Tragedies." *Independent Review*, v (April 1905), 309-319.

P. 147, title: ["The Tragedies of Voltaire"].

P. 147, l. 9: ["but Hyperion was written on the morrow of Salamis, and the Odes of Pindar were dedicated to George the Fourth"] > "but Hyperion might have been written on the morrow of Salamis, and the Odes of Pindar dedicated to George the Fourth."

P. 149, l. 16: ["has been drawing"] > "is drawing." BC adds a footnote dating the essay "April, 1905."

P. 149 l. 18: ["three hundred years hence a literal translation of Zaire will not be holding the English boards"] > "a hundred years hence, etc."

P. 150, l. 1: ["in 1736, when Voltaire's fame as a dramatist was already

well established"] > "in 1736, when Voltaire was forty-two years of age and his fame as a dramatist already well established."

P. 150, l. 18, paragraphing: see I, p. 53, l. 18, above.

III. "Sir Thomas Browne." *Independent Review*, VIII (January, 1906), 158-169.

P. 33, l. 12: ["Mr. Gosse, in his new volume on Sir Thomas Browne"] drops *new*.

P. 35, l. 11: ["Such is Mr. Gosse's account of the influence of Browne and Johnson upon the later eighteenth-century writers of prose. Nothing could be more superficial. To dismiss Johnson's influence as something altogether deplorable, is to misunderstand"] > "Such is Mr. Gosse's account of the influence of Browne and Johnson upon the later eighteenth-century writers of prose. But to dismiss Johnson's influence, etc."

P. 38, l. 1: omits everything in brackets: "'quodlibetically' altogether. [The harbourer of such thoughts, he feels,

'Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils;
The motions of his spirit are as dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus!'].

"The truth is." See also I, p. 53, l. 18, above.

P. 38, l. 9: ["curious irrelevance"] > "curious self-contradiction." Then Strachey omits this passage, which followed immediately: ["Madame Geoffrin's husband was once given a volume of the *Encyclopedia*, printed in double columns. The good man went through the book from cover to cover, reading every line straight across the page, as if there had been no division. At the end he pronounced the work an excellent one, 'mais un peu abstrait.' Comments on *Urn Burial* from a reader who has no taste for the ornate are precisely as valuable as those of Monsieur Geoffrin upon the *Encyclopedia*."]

P. 43, l. 13: ["'Cato seemed to dote upon a Cabbage'"] > "'Cato seemed to dote upon Cabbage.'"

Pp. 44, l. 13: ["Browne's ultimate object was to create some such vast and appalling effect as that"] > "Browne's ultimate object was to create some such tremendous effect as that."

IV. "The Poetry of Blake." *Independent Review*, IX (May, 1906), 215-226.

P. 219, l. 1: ["The new edition of Blake's poetical works, lately published"] drops *lately*.

Pp. 220-232, paragraphing: see I, p. 53, l. 18, above.

P. 222, l. 20: ["Editors may punctuate afresh the text of Shakespeare with impunity, and even with advantage."] Inserts *perhaps* between *and* and *even*.

Pp. 224-231: see I, p. 56, l. 8, above.

Pp. 226-227. Strachey originally set off the whole quotation from Raleigh beginning "The sentimental enthusiast" with quotation marks and also used quotation marks inside the quotation to set off "and who" and, with commas, "Sir Walter wittily adds." In revision Strachey drops the

quotation marks enclosing the whole passage and substitutes brackets for the two interior pairs of quotation marks and the commas.

V. "The Lives of the Poets." *Independent Review*, x (July, 1906), 108-113.

P. 74, l. 7: [“of too much of modern criticism”] > “of too much modern criticism.”

P. 75, last line: [“what the canons of poetry precisely were”] drops *precisely*.

P. 79, ll. 4-5: [“is now issued”] > “has been issued.”

VI. “The Last Elizabethan.” *New Quarterly*, I (November, 1907), 47-72.

P. 237, l. 9: [“could we”] > “would we.”

P. 237, l. 12: [“this great poet—for, as I hope to show, he deserves no meaner title—has not only never received the recognition”] > “this extraordinary poet has not only never received the recognition.”

P. 242, l. 18: drops everything in brackets below: “to resume his work. [The interlude has not survived; but if, as is highly probable, it contained the first sketch of the concluding scene of *Death's Jest Book*, one cannot be surprised at the flight of the locksmith. The enmities of Beddoes were as numerous as they were intense, and, wherever his warfare carried him, he was followed by a faithful squadron of his schoolfellows. His ascendancy, doubtless, depended in part upon physical strength; but it was nourished and animated by an invincible potency of spirit, a bright and inward flame. He knew the right word for each predicament; he hurled a nickname, and it stuck; his slang language lived on at Charterhouse long after he had gone. Heading his myrmidons, he braved the masters, or waged war with pensioners, celebrating his victories with lobsters and oysters, porter and gin, and crowning the feast with extemporaneous songs and dances. On these occasions, says Mr. Bevan, ‘Beddoes shone forth in all his glory’; we can believe it; but it is clear enough that Mr. Bevan himself, though he was able to appreciate the prowess of his leader, was not always quite at his ease. He joined the campaigns, he tells us, ‘by no means as a volunteer’; he was afraid of floggings from the school authorities; he was equally afraid of some sudden and inexplicable chastisement at the hands of his redoubtable friend. One day his worst fears were realized. In order to bring about an elaborate scheme of vengeance, Beddoes managed to abstract the fire-irons from every room in the school, and tying them all together, fastened them, at midnight, round Mr. Bevan’s neck, while he attached Mr. Bevan himself to the knocker on the gate of the College. Every movement produced an incredible concatenation of noises, which completely answered Beddoes’ purpose, ‘though,’ as Mr. Bevan adds, ‘at the expense to me of a licking, at the hands of the assembled servants.’ One cannot but suspect, from the tone of some of his remarks, that, at the time he wrote, this amazing piece of impishness was still rankling in Mr. Bevan’s mind. Perhaps that was only natural; for he never seems to have reflected that even a ‘licking’ may have been, after all, a small price to pay for the

delightful and extraordinary memory of being loaded by a poet with innumerable pairs of tongs.]”

P. 245, l. 2: [“Lenora’s speech (too long to quote in full) ends thus”] > “Lenora’s speech ends thus.”

P. 249, l. 10: [“he would shut himself for days into his bedroom”] > “he would shut himself for days in his bedroom.”

P. 259, l. 9, paragraphing: see I, p. 53, l. 18, above.

P. 262, l. 20: drops everything in brackets below: “drink to the health of Death. [One may weep over the ruin of beauty; one may long for the approaches of annihilation; one may return to the living, and whisper to them the lesson one has learnt from the old ghost—‘Who knows? Perhaps you are the dead yourselves.’]”

P. 263, l. 17: Hamlet [“lugged the guts into the other room”] > Hamlet “lugged the guts into the neighbor room.”

VII. “Racine.” *New Quarterly*, I (June, 1908), 361-384.

P. 3, original title: [“The Poetry of Racine”].

P. 3, l. 1: [“When David painted his vast ‘Apotheosis of Homer’”] > “When Ingres painted his vast ‘Apotheosis of Homer.’” So l. 10.

P. 3, l. 15: [“an English popular painter”] drops *popular*.

Pp. 3-24, paragraphing: see I, p. 53, l. 18, above.

P. 4, l. 8: [“The question is perplexing, and it has lately been illustrated in a singular way. Mr. J. C. Bailey, in his recent volume of essays entitled *The Claims of French Poetry*, has discussed the qualities of Racine at some length, has placed him, not without contumely, among the second rank of writers, and has drawn the conclusion”] > “The perplexing question was recently emphasised and illustrated in a singular way. Mr. John Bailey, in a volume of essays entitled *The Claims of French Poetry*, discussed the qualities of Racine at some length, placed him, not without contumely, among the second rank of writers, and drew the conclusion.”

P. 4, l. 17: [“qualified panegyric is sounded”] drops *is*.

P. 6, l. 2: [“this article”] > “this essay.”

P. 6, l. 4: [“Mr. Bailey’s essay”] > “Mr. Bailey’s paper.”

P. 6, l. 18: [“is to have learnt a new happiness, and to have discovered something exquisite and splendid, significant beyond the boundaries of art”] > “is to have learnt a new happiness, to have discovered something exquisite and splendid, to have enlarged the glorious boundaries of art.”

P. 7, last line: [“a great park”] > “an open forest.”

P. 10, l. 7: [“the lack of local colour”] > “the absence of local colour.”

P. 11, l. 8: [“to find fault with Tintoretto for not painting with the scrupulousness of De Hooghe”] > “to find fault with a Mozart quartet for not containing the orchestration of Wagner.”

P. 13, l. 14: [“our poetry, our prose, and our whole conception of the art of writing has fallen”] > “our poetry, our prose, and our whole conception of the art of writing have fallen.”

P. 19, l. 10: [“When we come across an abyss of mystery in a single perfectly simple phrase—

‘La fille de Minos et de Pasiphaé

we are apt not to see that it is there."] > "When we come across the mysterious accent of fatality and remote terror in a single perfectly simple phrase—

La fille de Minos et de Pasiphaé

we are apt not to hear that it is there."

P. 19, l. 14: ["But there is another reason: the craving"] > "But there is another reason—the craving."

P. 19, l. 18: ["key to the secret of life"] > "key to the secret life."

P. 23, l. 22: ["agricultural instruments"] > "agricultural implements."

P. 28, l. 12: ["to ask whether he is better or worse than Shelley or than Virgil—is to attempt impossibilities; one might as well try to weigh the merits of cold salmon and a rose. But there is one fact"] > "to ask whether he is better or worse than Shelley or than Virgil—is to attempt impossibilities; but there is one fact."

VIII. "The Rousseau Affair." *New Quarterly*, III (May, 1910), 147-157. Erroneously dated 1907 on p. 215 of *BC*.

P. 205, l. 17: ["These *Mémoires* were first printed in 1818, and the concluding quarter of the book contains"] > "This work was first printed in 1818, and the concluding quarter of it contains."

P. 206, l. 12: ["Mr. Morley"] > "Lord Morley." So p. 211, l. 18.

P. 207, l. 12: ["that the narrative in the *Mémoires* cannot be regarded"] > "that Madame d'Epina's narrative cannot be regarded."

P. 207, l. 18: ["printed *Mémoires*"] > "printed version."

P. 207, l. 23: ["*Mémoires*"] > "book." So p. 212, l. 21.

P. 209, l. 8: ["the garbled and concocted manuscript of the *Mémoires* of Madame d'Epina"] > "her garbled and concocted manuscripts."

P. 213, l. 19: ["an 'excellent reason,' which would have delighted that good knight Sir Andrew Aguecheek"] > "an 'exquisite reason,' which would have delighted that good knight Sir Andrew Aguecheek."

IX. "Madame Du Deffand." *Edinburgh Review*, CCXVII (January, 1913), 61-80. Apparently the first publication signed "Lytton Strachey" rather than "G. L. Strachey." Even *Landmarks in French Literature* (1912) is signed "G. L. Strachey."

P. 83, footnote: drops the last three of the four titles listed in the original review article. So p. 115. On p. 167 all five titles, and on p. 269 all six, are dropped.

P. 95, l. 28: ["the whole existence of Madame du Deffand hinged"] > "the whole of her existence hinged."

P. 97, l. 8: ["talk continuously flowed"] > "talk continually flowed."

P. 102, l. 12: ["this old lady of high society, who had never given a thought to her style, and wrote by the light of nature"] > "this old lady of high society, who had never given a thought to her style, who wrote—and spelt—by the light of nature."

X. "Henri Beyle." *Edinburgh Review*, CCXIX (January, 1914), 35-52.

P. 269: see IX, p. 83, footnote, above.

P. 285, l. 2: ["joined with—an exactitude of exposition"] > "joined with such an exactitude of exposition."

P. 290, l. 20: ["the extraordinary pages of Nietzsche"] drops *extraordinary*.

P. 293. At the end of the final paragraph Strachey omits everything in brackets: "In such a Paradise of Frenchmen we may leave Henri Beyle. [Of him, even more than of other mortals, our judgment must be ambiguous and undecided. But of one thing at least we may be sure in his unaccommodating case. It may be difficult to strike a balance between the blemishes and the genius of his writings, between the profundities and the narrowness of his thought, between the charm and the futilities of his character; but this, at any rate, we may say of him with certainty: he was an extraordinary man.]"

XI. "Voltaire and England." *Edinburgh Review*, ccxx (October, 1914), 392-411.

P. 115: see IX, p. 83, footnote, above.

P. 115: rewrites the first paragraph:

["The visit of Voltaire to England marks a turning-point in the history of civilisation. It was the first step in that long process of interaction between the French and English cultures whose results have been so momentous in the development of Europe, and are sufficiently visible at the present hour. Before Voltaire the forces of mutual ignorance and political hostility had combined for centuries to keep the two nations apart. It was he who planted the small seed of friendship which, in spite of a thousand hostile influences, in spite of Napoleon, in spite of all the powers of hereditary enmity and instinctive distrust, was to grow and flourish so mightily. Doubtless the seed fell on good ground; doubtless if Voltaire had never left his native country some chance wind would have carried it over the narrow seas, and, in the main, history would have been unaltered. Yet it is worth remembering that actually his was the hand which did the work. That close and singular relationship between the French and the English, which, underlying and transcending the combinations of politics, has found its consummation at Mons and at Cambrai, on the Oise and on the Marne, began to exist when a remarkably thin young man, with darting eyes and a smile of ambiguous significance, stepped briskly on shore at Dover nearly two hundred years ago."] >

"The visit of Voltaire to England marks a turning-point in the history of civilisation. It was the first step in a long process of interaction—big with momentous consequences—between the French and English cultures. For centuries the combined forces of mutual ignorance and political hostility had kept the two nations apart: Voltaire planted a small seed of friendship which, in spite of a thousand hostile influences, grew and flourished mightily. The seed, no doubt, fell on good ground, and no doubt, if Voltaire had never left his native country, some chance wind would have carried it over the narrow seas, so that history in the main would have been unaltered. But actually his was the hand which did the work."

P. 116, l. 10: [“has made French scholarship one of the unique glories of European culture”] drops *unique*.

XII. “Voltaire and Frederick the Great.” *Edinburgh Review*, ccxxii (October, 1915), 351-373.

P. 167: see IX, p. 83, footnote, above.

P. 182, l. 18: [“still he is uncertain”] > “still he lingers on.”

P. 184, l. 1: [“Each knew well enough the weak spot in his own position”] drops *own*.

P. 195, l. 15, paragraphing: see I, p. 53, l. 18, above.

XIII. “Lady Hester Stanhope.” *Athenaeum*, April 4 and April 11, 1919, pp. 131-133, 166-167.

P. 297: omits [I] from just beneath the title.

P. 300, l. 3: [“not but for long”] > “but not for long.”

P. 302, l. 16: [II] is omitted in *BC* before the paragraph beginning “The rumour of her exploits.”

P. 302, l. 16: [“Lady Hester’s exploits”] > “her exploits.”

XIV. “Mr. Creevey.” *Athenaeum*, June 13, 1919, pp. 453-455; and *New Republic*, xix (June 7, 1919), 178-9. Collation with the *Athenaeum* shows no revisions.

CHARLES RICHARD SANDERS

Duke University

UNNOTICED TRANSLATIONS OF BALZAC IN AMERICAN PERIODICALS

Balzac's literary fortune in the United States has been studied by Professor Benjamin Griffith in a book entitled *Balzac en Amérique*.¹ In the introductory chapter,² where he stresses the small number of readers which the French novelist reached in the United States until the first American translation of the whole of the *Comédie Humaine* began to appear in 1885, Griffith speaks briefly of the

¹ Paris, Les Presses Modernes, 1930, 283 pp. This book was reprinted by Les Presses Modernes in 1931 under the title, *Balzac aux Etats-Unis*, 267 pp., and a supplement consisting of a list of errata and an index with a separate pagination (pp. 3-8). The second edition differs from the first only in very minor details. The most significant of these is the omission of two pages dealing with Miss Margaret Murray Gibb's study, *Le Roman de Bas-de-Cuir; Etude sur Fenimore Cooper et son Influence en France* (Paris, 1927). In the first edition of Griffith's book the passage in question runs from p. 167 to p. 169.

² “La Vogue de Balzac en Amérique,” pp. 8-17, 1930 ed.; 8-16, 1931 ed.

Balzac materials published in American periodicals previous to that date, and confines his list to six items.³ A check of early American periodical literature by Dr. Albert L. Rabinovitz⁴ has since revealed four translations which the author of *Balzac en Amérique* failed to notice.⁵ The purpose of this article is to call the attention of the reader to nine additional items, to which no reference has been made either by Griffith or by Rabinovitz. It may not be without interest to point out, moreover, that, out of these nine items overlooked by them, eight are to be found in the *New York Mirror*, and one in the *Democratic Review*, magazines in which five of the translations which they mention were published.⁶

The fact that a large portion of the materials listed below are relatively brief and that several of the early editions of Balzac's works are not available in this country would make it impossible

³ Griffith's list contains the following items: "Madame Firmiani," *New York Mirror*, January 14-21, 1837; Joseph Price, "The Countess with two Husbands" (*Le Colonel Chabert*), *ibid.*, July 22—September 9, 1837; Edward S. Gould, "Father Goriot, or Scenes of Life in Paris," *The New World*, March 16—May 18, 1844; "Melmoth Redeemed," (*Melmoth Réconcilié*), *ibid.*, October 5, 1844; "Sworn on the Crucifix" (*La Grande Bretèche*), *Every Saturday*, June 29, 1872; and Balzac's review of Fennimore Cooper's novel, *The Pathfinder*, *Knickerbocker*, XVII, January, 1841, pp. 72-77. The French original had appeared in the *Revue Parisienne* of July, 1840.

⁴ *New York University Index to Early American Periodical Literature, 1728-1870. No. 5. French Fiction* (New York, 1943), pp. 11-14.

⁵ These are: "La Femme comme il faut" (Approximately 4000 words from *Autre Etude de Femme*, Conard edition, VII, pp. 379-392), *Corsair*, November 16, 1839, pp. 575-576; "El Verdugo," *Democratic Review*, September, 1843, pp. 303-308, reprinted in *Anglo-American*, September 23, 1843, pp. 515-516; "La Grande Bretèche, a Tale," *Democratic Review*, November, 1843, pp. 529-535; Mrs. F. A. Butler, "La Vendetta, or the Feud. A Tale," *ibid.*, September, 1845, pp. 173-182; October, 1845, pp. 276-289; November, 1845, pp. 364-379.

⁶ Griffith refers the reader to Royce's *Bibliography of Balzac* in connection with two translations published in the *New York Mirror*. They are, however, nowhere listed in Royce's book. It may be added at this point that, of all the translations mentioned in this article, "An Episode under the Terror," *Lippincott's Magazine*, March, 1912, pp. 431-445, and "A Passion in the Desert," *Booklovers' Magazine*, Nov. 1903, pp. 477-489, are the only ones to which a reference is to be found in Royce's bibliography, where they are listed as items nos. 1689 and 2780. We list them in this study, because in Royce's work they are lost among thousands of titles, and are therefore very difficult to find.

to ascertain in every case which version the translator used as well as to study in detail the changes made by him. It is therefore our intention to point out only the most important divergences from the French text as reproduced in the Conard edition. All selections contained in the nine items overlooked by Griffith and Rabinovitz have been identified with the exception of two passages of seventeen and thirty-seven words respectively:⁷

1. Joseph Price. Popular French Literature. Scenes of Private Life Adapted from De Balzac, for the *New York Mirror*. *New York Mirror*, Sept. 17, 1836, pp. 89-90.

I. (170 words.)	<i>Une double famille</i> , Conard, III, p. 228.
II. (150 words.)	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp. 229-230.
III. (540 words.)	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp. 235-237.
IV. (1025 words.)	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 245-251.
V. (800 words.)	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp. 251-256.
VI. (1735 words.)	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp. 297-303.

2. Joseph Price. Popular French Literature. Scenes of Private Life Adapted from De Balzac, for the *New York Mirror*. *New York Mirror*, Sept. 24, 1836, pp. 101-102.

I. The Usurer. (2920 words.)	<i>Gobseck</i> , Conard, v, pp. 383-389.
II. A Business Transaction. (1860 words.)	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp. 408-415.

3. Joseph Price. Popular French Literature. Thoughts, Feelings and Fancies Adapted from De Balzac. *New York Mirror*, Oct. 18, 1836, p. 117.

True love independent of personal beauty. (430 words.)	<i>La Recherche de l'Absolu</i> , Conard, xxviii, pp. 140-141.
The ardour of youthful fancy. (350 words.)	<i>Le Message</i> , Conard, iv, pp. 206-207.
Husband and Wife. (355 words.)	<i>Ibid.</i> , pp. 212-213.
A Spanish Woman's Love. (85 words.)	<i>La Recherche de l'Absolu</i> , Conard, xxviii, p. 146.
A Mournful Truth. (37 words.) *	Unidentified.
A Nice Distinction. (17 words.) *	Unidentified.

⁷ (1). "Religion and its ministers are two things which are confounded together in a great many persons' mind." (2) "Love and repugnance must be ever on the growth between people who are constantly brought into contact. Each instant, and every occasion, must suggest reasons and motives for the increase of love and the aggravation of dislike."

* For text of this passage, see note 7 (2).

* For text, see note 7 (1).

4. J. P. Popular French Literature. Thoughts, Feelings and Fancies Adapted from De Balzac. *New York Mirror*, Oct. 15, 1836, pp. 125-126.

The cause why old maids are disagreeable. (860 words.) *Le Curé de Tours*, Conard, ix, pp. 199-201.

A Spanish Beauty. (275 words.) *Les Marana*, Conard, xxix, pp. 68-69.

The Food of Passion. (345 words.) *La Femme abandonnée*, Conard, iv, p. 306.

The Life of an Artist in Paris. (290 words.) *La Fille aux yeux d'or*, Conard, xiii, p. 333.

Contrast of Parisian Features. (250 words.) *Ibid.*, p. 338.

The Boudoir of the Girl with the Golden Hair. (840 words.) *Ibid.*, pp. 380-383.

5. Joseph Price. Popular French Literature. The French Dragoon and Spanish Maiden. Adapted from De Balzac. *New York Mirror*, Oct. 29, 1836, pp. 140-141.

Three extracts of 1845, 185, and 2415 words respectively. *Les Marana*, Conard, xxix, pp. 81-86, 88-89, 89-96.

6. Joseph Price. Popular French Literature. Portraits and Sketches. *New York Mirror*, Nov. 19, 1836, p. 165.

A Mother and Daughter. (395 words.) *Sarrasine*, Conard, xvi, pp. 393-394.

A Sculptor's Illusion. (1245 words.) *Ibid.*, pp. 411-415.

7. J. P. Original Sketches from the French. A Glance at High Life. *New York Mirror*, June 10, 1837, p. 396.

An extract of 1565 words. *Le Père Goriot*, Conard, vi, pp. 370-373.

8. Anon. Sketches of Parisian Manners. The Police Spy and Gentleman Convict. *New York Mirror*, Feb. 24, 1838, pp. 276-277, and March 3, 1838, pp. 284-285.

February 24. A Touch of Juvenile Philosophy. (675 words.) *Le Père Goriot*, Conard, vi, pp. 361-363.

How to bait a Mantrap. (2150 words.) *Ibid.*, pp. 390-397.

March 3. Putting a little salt on the Bird's Tail. (640 words.) *Ibid.*, pp. 415-417.

The Falling of the Trap. (2560 words.) *Ibid.*, pp. 417-431.

9. Anon. The Mother and Son. A Tale of the French Revolution. *Democratic Review*, June, 1843, pp. 618-626.

Le Réquisitionnaire, Conard, xxix, pp. 133-153.

The signature J. P. at the end of the excerpts in the *New York Mirror* of October 15, 1836, refers undoubtedly to Joseph Price, whose name appears in full at the bottom of six other Balzac items published in the same periodical. It can be assumed that Price also translated the unsigned selections from *Le Père Goriot*, which appeared in the *Mirror* of February 24, and March 3, 1838. The style of these English versions is similar to that of earlier translations made by him. All efforts to find any biographical data about Joseph Price have been unsuccessful. No clue has been discovered either concerning the identity of the anonymous translator of *Le Réquisitionnaire*, published in the *Democratic Review* of June, 1843.

Price's translations are mediocre. They fail to bring out the niceties of the original. His style is flat and conventional and the difficult phrases are often loosely rendered. In the shorter selections Price follows the French closely and drops only insignificant details. In the longer ones, to be more specific, those from *Une double famille*, IV, V, VI, *Gobseck*, and *Le Père Goriot*, he makes longer and more numerous excisions. 350 words have been omitted in the moral and physical description of Gobseck, and 650 more in the long monologue in which he explains his views about money and power. The passage devoted to his family history, some 630 words, has been also dropped. The second extract from the same novel contains numerous, although shorter omissions. The episode of Vautrin's capture as related by Balzac in *Le Père Goriot* has been considerably abridged by Price. These changes in *Une double famille*, *Gobseck*, and *Le Père Goriot* seem to have been dictated by a desire to eliminate long developments and save space, which was very necessary since the *New York Mirror* printed only eight pages of text.

The item found in the *Democratic Review* of June, 1843, as well as the other three already noted in the same periodical by Rabinowitz, is very different from those which appeared in the *New York Mirror*. The first of these magazines published translations of short stories by Balzac, while the second offered mostly extracts from his longer works. The majority of these extracts were quite brief and presented slight narrative interest. Short stories constituted, of course, an intrinsically more interesting type of material

than that found in the *Mirror*. The translations published in the *Democratic Review* were also of a higher quality. The text of the French original was faithfully reproduced except in the case of *La Grande Bretèche*, where many omissions were made.

In his chapter, "Les Traductions,"¹⁰ Griffith restricts himself entirely to a study of complete translations of *La Comédie Humaine* since 1885 and does not take into consideration translations of individual works or stories. I have succeeded in locating ten versions of Balzac's short stories in American periodicals between 1885 and 1929. The first edition of Griffith's study came out in 1930. The list which follows does not claim to be exhaustive:

1. J. Alfred Burgan. A Passion in the Desert. *Booklovers' Magazine* (Philadelphia),¹¹ Nov. 1903, pp. 477-489. *Une Passion dans le désert*, Conard, xxII, pp. 387-403.
2. Anon. The Conscript. *Outlook*, July 25, 1908, pp. 714-725.¹² *Le Réquisitionnaire*, Conard, xxIX, pp. 133-153.
3. J. Berg Esenwein.¹³ An Episode under the Terror. *Lippincott's Magazine*, March, 1912, pp. 431-445. *Un Episode sous la terreur*, Conard, xxI, pp. 1-25.
4. Anon. El Verdugo. *Golden Book*, April, 1925, pp. 555-560. *El Verdugo*, Conard, xxIX, pp. 155-169.
5. Anon. A Passion in the Desert. *Golden Book*, Nov. 1925, pp. 696-702. *Une Passion dans le désert*, Conard, xxII, pp. 387-403.
6. Anon. Christ in Flanders. *Golden Book*, Dec. 1925, pp. 743-751. *Jésus-Christ en Flandre*, Conard, xxVII, pp. 295-316.

¹⁰ Pp. 54-69, 1930 ed.; 50-64, 1931 ed.

¹¹ I have been unable to find any information about this translator. *The Booklovers' Magazine*, published from 1903 to 1905, was later continued under the name of *Appleton's Magazine*.

¹² This item and the next one are listed in the bibliography at the end of Griffith's book, but without any comment or explanation, so that it is impossible to tell whether they are translations of these short stories or articles about them.

¹³ Joseph Berg Esenwein was born in 1867. He has been successively manager of *The Booklovers' Magazine*, 1903-1905, manager and editor of *Lippincott's Magazine*, 1905-1914, and editor of the *Writer's Monthly*, since 1916. Mr. Esenwein has written extensively on public speaking, English composition, and the technique of the short story.

7. Anon. *La Grande Bretèche.* *Golden Book*, Oct. 1927, pp. 534-543.
Autre Etude de femme, Conard, vii, pp. 406-430.
8. Anon. *Gaudissart the Great.* *Golden Book*, Jan. 1928, pp. 97-114.
L'Illustré Gaudissart, Conard, x, pp. 3-50.
9. Anon. *A Seaside Drama.* *Golden Book*, June, 1928, pp. 809-818.
Un Drame au bord de la mer, Conard, xxix, pp. 171-196.
10. Anon. *In the Time of the Terror.* *Golden Book*, Feb. 1929, pp. 102-108.
Un Episode sous la terreur, Conard, xxi, pp. 1-25.

These versions are all close reproductions of the original. The only deviations noticed were found in *A Passion in the Desert* and in *The Conscript*. In *A Passion in the Desert* the entire introduction (some 400 words), as well as three long passages and a short one (approximately 950 words in the body of the story), has been dropped in the text reproduced in the *Booklovers' Magazine*. In *The Conscript* the translator has omitted only six lines from the original.

By way of concluding this article, eight other translations which have come out since the publication of Griffith's study in 1930 may be mentioned here. They all appeared in the *Golden Book* and, except for one of them, are the work of anonymous translators.

1. *The Elixir of Don Juan.* Sept. 1930, pp. 60-69.
L'Elixir de longue vie, Conard, xxx, pp. 345-364.
2. B. Williams,¹⁴ *Facino Cane's Lost Treasure.* April, 1931, pp. 80-84.
Facino Cane, Conard, xvi, pp. 371-387.
3. *The Red House.* Feb. 1932, pp. 163-176.
L'Auberge rouge, Conard, xxix, pp. 273-317.
4. *Innocence.* June, 1932, pp. 515-516.
Naïveté, Contes Drolatiques, Conard, xxxvii, pp. 175-179.
5. *Lost by a laugh.* June, 1933, pp. 523-527.
Autre Etude de Femme, Conard, vii, pp. 398-405.
6. *Christ in Flanders.* December, 1933, pp. 488-500.
Jésus-Christ en Flandre, Conard, xxvii, pp. 295-316.
7. *Madame's Last Reception. A Story of Intrigue and Sacrifice during the Reign of Terror.* Nov. 1934, pp. 560-570.
Le Réquisitionnaire, Conard, xxix, pp. 133-153.

¹⁴ Blanche Colton Williams (1879-1944) taught English at Teachers College, Columbia University, from 1908 to 1939. Miss Williams wrote

8. *False Courtesan*. May, 1935, pp. 457-462. *La Faule Courtisane, Contes Drolatiques*, Conard, xxxvii, pp. 311-326.

Christ in Flanders reproduces closely a version published in the *Golden Book* of December, 1925. Whatever differences occur are due in the main to changes in paragraphing. A few cuts, amounting in all to about twelve lines, have been made in *Le Réquisitionnaire (Madame's Last Reception)*.¹⁵ The American version of *L'Elixir de longue vie* (*The Elixir of Don Juan*) does not carry the note containing the text of the song "Le Convoi du Duc de Guise."¹⁶ *Facino Cane* has been shortened by suppressing the long philosophic discussion which served as an introduction in the original.¹⁷ *La Faule Courtisane* has been reduced very considerably through the omission of several passages, all of a licentious character, except for one.¹⁸ At least one third of *L'Auberge rouge* (*The Red House*) has been left out in the English text. *Innocence* (*Naïfveté* in the French version) and *Lost by a Laugh*, an extract from *Autre Etude de Femme*, are accurate reproductions of the original and need no comment.

J.-M. CARRIÈRE

The University of Virginia

SOME DEBATABLE WORDS IN PEARL AND ITS THEME

Stanza 5 of *Pearl* would seem to indicate quite definitely the homiletic character of the poem:

Bifore þat spot my honde I spennd For care ful colde þat to me cæst; A deuely dele in my hert dennen þaȝ resoun sette myseluen saȝt.	50
---	----

extensively on the short story. She also edited, alone and in collaboration, several collections of short stories.

¹⁵ The longest of these cuts, seven lines in the Conard text, is represented by the omission of the last sentence of the story.

¹⁶ Conard, xxx, pp. 363-364.

¹⁷ Conard, xvi, pp. 371-373, approximately 700 words.

¹⁸ Four lengthy passages and one short one, approximately 1500 words in all, have been omitted from the English text of "La Faule Courtisane" published in the *Golden Book*.

I playned my perle þat þer waȝt spenned
 Wyth fyrte skylleȝ þat faste faȝt;
 þaȝ kynde of Kryst me comfort kenned,
 My wretched wylle in wo ay wraȝte.
 I felle vpon þat flory flaȝt!
 Suche odor to my herneȝ schot
 I slode vpon a slepyng-slaȝte
 On þat prec[i]os perle wythouten spot.

Deuely (51), which like many other words in *Pearl* has puzzled editors and translators,¹ is probably OE. *deoflic*, ‘devilish,’ ‘wicked.’ The line reads then—

A wicked grief lodged in my heart.

The grief of the jeweler was wicked because it was contrary to reason (52) and to Christian teaching (55), and because it was deliberately indulged (56). And it is the jeweler himself who comments thus upon his own culpability. He was guilty of one of the ‘seven deadly sins,’ *covetyse*, inordinate love of earthly goods. Walter Hilton, the *Pearl* author’s contemporary, writes of this sin as follows:

Covetousness also is slain in a soul by the working of love, for it maketh the soul so covetous of spiritual good and so influenced to heavenly riches that it setteth right nought by all earthly things. It hath no more joy in the having of a precious stone than a chalk stone . . . It setteth all things that must perish at one price . . . for he knows well that all these earthly things which worldly men set so great price by and love so dearly must pass away and turn to nothing both the thing itself and the love of it. And therefore he worketh his thoughts betimes into that judgment and esteem of them which they must come to hereafter, and so accounteth them as nought.²

This passage from Hilton might well furnish a key to the theme of the poem. A jeweler, having lost a pearl which he particularly (*in synglure*, 8)³ prized—prized above his very spiritual welfare

¹ Richard Morris and Israel Gollancz (ed. 1891) read the MS., *denely*; C. G. Osgood, Jr. (ed. 1906), emends *de[r]uely*, glossing, adv. as adj., ‘sudden’; G. G. Coulton (trans. 1906) ignores the difficulty, translating the line, ‘Dinned in my brain a doleful song.’

² Walter Hilton, *The Scale of Perfection* (reprint of Cressy’s text, 1901) Bk. III, ch. ix, 267 ff.

³ The MS. *synglure* may stand, since in the poem -er and -ur words of French origin are not distinguished. Cf. *gyngure*, 43, and probably *lere*, 616. (See n. *infra*). The form is found elsewhere, as, e.g., ‘Synglure

and to such a degree as to make nought of his sins (*devoyde my wrange*, 15)⁴—is gradually won to a conviction of the nothingness (*noȝt*, 274) of earthly riches in comparison with the value, the beauty, and the bliss of the immortal soul. This doctrine—held of paramount importance and in origin divine by spiritual teachers down the centuries since Our Lord's utterance of it in the words: ‘What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?’—was a doctrine which the *Pearl* author—if he is also the author of *Patience* and *Purity*—had much in mind. Cf. *Patience* (ed. Bateson), 13-14:

Thay ar happen þat han in hert pouerte,
For hores is þe heuen-ryche to holde for euer.

Purity (ed. Menner) 177-181 lists covetousness or the absence of this poverty of spirit among the faults which may so obliterate the thought of eternal happiness as to endanger a man's ultimate vision of God:

For fele fauteȝ may a freke forgete his blysse,
þat he þe Soverayn ne se þen for slope one,
As for bobaunce and bost, and bolnande pryde,
Proly into þe develeȝ þrote man þryngȝ bylyve;
For covetyse, and colwarde and crokede . . .

The word *perle* throughout the poem (*Pearl*) stands sometimes for the material gem (1, 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 1173), sometimes for the soul, the pearl of great price (258, 1182, 1192), sometimes for the kingdom of Heaven itself or the bliss thereof (732, 733-39). The jeweler at the beginning of his dream-vision identifies *perle*, the soul, with his material jewel—a natural error, as dreams go, since immediately prior to the *slepyng-slatte* (59), he had been absorbed in grief over his loss.

The concluding stanzas of the poem emphasize the theme. Stanza 99 is particularly relevant:

Me payed ful ille to be outfleme
So sodenly of þat fayre regioune—
Fro alle þo syȝteȝ so quyke & queme.

personæ I doo none name,' *Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century* (ed. C. Brown), No. 173. Gollancz (ed. 1891) emends *synglere*; Osgood (ed. 1906), *syng[u]l[e]re*; Gollancz (ed. 1921) accepts Osgood's emendation.

⁴ *Wrang* here as in *Patience* (ed. Bateson) 376: *þat þat penaunce pleased him þat playnes on her wronge.*

A longeyng heuy me strok in swone.
 & rewfully þenne I con to reme.
 'O perle,' quod I, 'of rych renoun,
 So watz hit me dere þat þou con deme
 In þys veray avysyoun.
 If hit be ueray & soth sermoun
 þat þou so stykeȝ in garlante gay,
 So wel is me in þys doel-doungoun
 þat þou art to þat Prynseȝ paye.'

1180

For 1182-1184, I suggest the translation:

"O pearl," quoth I, "of rich renown,
 So [i. e., to a like degree] was *it* precious to me
 which thou didst appraise
 In this true vision."

Hit (1183) refers to the material pearl, which had been deemed of highest value by its owner until the vision maiden (*of rych renoun*) had explained its nothingness. Lines 1185-1188 may be paraphrased as follows: 'If I am to believe that you (the soul) will be thus set in a bright garland (the heavenly procession in which she had appeared to him), then my sufferings upon this earth are right—provided that you (the soul) please God.'

The MS. *stykeȝ* (1186),⁵ OE. *stician*, may be retained, with its ordinary meaning. The present may be used as future—a not uncommon use in ME., and occurring elsewhere in *Pearl*, e. g., *schyneȝ* (28)—though the verb may be read as present without impairing the sense. Parallels to *garlante*,⁶ as I have translated it, appear in Dante. Cf. *Paradiso* x, 91-93, of the souls encircling Beatrice:

Tu vuoi saper di quai piante s'infiora
 questa ghirlanda, che intorno vagheggia
 la bella donna ch'al ciel t'avvalora.

Paradiso XII, 19-20, repeats the figure:

Così di quelle sempiterne rose
 volgeansi circa noi le due ghirlande . . .

⁵ Gollancz and Osgood emend, *st[r]ykeȝ*; yet Osgood, *op. cit.*, n. 735-736, quotes from the hymn of St. Ephrem, 'Like pearls in a diadem, children are inserted in the kingdom.'

⁶ *garlante*, according to Gollancz, Osgood, and G. G. Coulton, is the crown worn by the maiden (205).

Souls are described as 'precious stones,' *lapilli*, *Paradiso* xx, 16, and specifically as 'pearls,' *margarite*, in xxii, 29. Having also the appearance of rubies—*Parea ciascuna rubinetto*, xix, 4—souls are addressed by Dante as 'everlasting flowers'—*perpetui fiori*, xix, 22.

The last stanza of *Pearl* lends weight to the argument in regard to the author's homiletic intention:

To pay þe Prince oþer sete sãste,
Hit is ful eþe to þe god Krystin;
For I haf founden Hym boþe day & naȝte
A God, a Lorde, a Frende ful fyin.
Ouer þis hyiil þis lote I laȝte,
For pyty of my perle enclyin,
& syþen to God I hit bytaȝte
In Krystes dere blesyng & myn,
þat, in the forme of bred & wyn,
þe preste vus scheweȝ vch a daye.
He gef vus to be Hys homly hyne
Ande precious perleȝ vnto His pay.

1205

I offer a literal translation :

To please the Prince or be reconciled,
It is quite easy for the good Christian;
For I have found Him both day and night
A God, a Lord, a Friend full fine,
Upon this hill this destiny I grasped,
Prostrate in sorrow for my pearl;
And thereupon to God I gave it up,
Through Christ's dear grace and love,
Whom, in the form of bread and wine,
The priest to us shows every day.
He granted us to be His household servants
And precious pearls unto His pleasure.

1205

þis lote (1205) looks back to 1201-1204, the lot or destiny of a Christian being service of God and friendship with Him—a truth comprehended (*laȝte*, 1205) by the jeweler through the vision-maiden's teaching. The impediment to this service and friendship—inordinate attachment to the lost pearl—is by the grace of God removed (1207).

* For *in*, 'by,' 'through,' cf. *in Godeȝ grace*, 63. The usual translation of *in* is 'in' or 'into.' *Myn* is usually translated as the pronoun, with, I think, an unsatisfactory sense. Imperfect rhyme, here occasioned by *myn*, 'love,' is not exceptional in *Pearl*.

*Gef*⁸ is no doubt the preterite indicative as in 174, 270, 734, 765, stating the fact of the Redemption, with which the poem is so largely concerned. It was Our Lord, the jeweler says, Who brought it about that we are not outcasts—as we were after the sin of our first parents (639 ff.)—but are truly His household servants and precious pearls pleasing to Him. The phrasing is recognizable as an echo of St. Paul, *Ephesians* 2. 18, 19: ‘For by him we have access both in one Spirit to the Father. Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and domestics of God.’

The theory—for many years accepted without question—that *Pearl* is subjective, its author’s lament over the death of his two-year old daughter, receives its strongest support from l. 483,

þou lyfed not two ȝer in oure þede.

If it is remembered, however, that the jeweler’s pearl was not of the inferior type found in British waters,⁹ but a peerless jewel imported from the Orient, this line and those following it take on a meaning consonant with the interpretation of the poem offered in the present article. ‘You are an Oriental,’ the jeweler says to the maiden of the dream vision, still mistaking her for that pearl which had glittered away (*aglyȝte*, 245)¹⁰ from him into the grass. ‘You lived not two years in our country—not long enough to learn even the ordinary Christian prayers, the *Our Father* and the *Creed*. How, therefore, could you possibly be made queen immediately upon your arrival in Paradise?’

The visionmaiden replies to the jeweler’s question not directly, but with a discourse upon the vocation of every soul to that high estate (*lere*, 616)¹¹ which was hers, with a discussion of the sacraments of Baptism and Penance, of God’s grace and of rewards.

⁸ *Gef* here is pronounced a present subjunctive by Gollancz and by Carleton Brown, *MLN.*, xxxiv (1919), 42-45, both expecting the conventional mediaeval prayer at the end of the poem. Osgood, also expecting the prayer, calls *gef* (pret.) a ‘probable error for *gyue* (pres. subj.)’

⁹ Osgood, *op. cit.*, p. 54, n. 3, and Gollancz (ed. 1921), p. 115, n. 3, emphasize the fact that the best pearls came from the Orient.

¹⁰ *aglyȝte* (cf. *glyȝt*, 114), derived by both Gollancz and Osgood from ON. *glia*, ‘shine, glitter’—a meaning particularly applicable to a jewel—is forced by both into the meaning ‘slip away,’ as if from *aglidan*.

¹¹ The MS. *lere*, emended [*h*]ere, ‘hire, wage,’ by Gollancz and Osgood may possibly be the same as *lure* with the meaning ‘estate.’ Cf. E.

But why did she not instantly correct the jeweler's error regarding her identity? Why did the poet represent her as almost encouraging the jeweler in his obsession? Why but because the poet wished his poem to go on? As a whole, the poem surely attests the diligence of the author in gathering an abundance of material from Holy Scripture for the edification of his readers. That material would have been completely wasted had he permitted his imagined jeweler to understand immediately the truth about the vision-maiden. If he, the jeweler, had at once recognized her as the soul, all the appealing narrative of the Laborers in the Vineyard, all the pageantry of the subject matter appropriated from the *Apocalypse* would have been lost to the poet's readers. There would have been no further opportunity for the exercise of that joy of mediaeval writers, the debate. The theme itself would have lacked the persuasive force lent to it by an incomparable artistry.

For, inspired by objective truth, a maker of beauty out of material already at hand, the author was, in the mediaeval sense, a true artist. He was, in addition, a theologian conversant with that branch of the sacred science known as mystical theology, and, therefore, clear on the mystical status of his fictional jeweler. The latter is depicted as in what might be called the primary grade of mysticism, the primer class. In the course of the vision-experience he was instructed in the *A, B, C* of the mystical life, renunciation. It was through his rash attempt to reach Paradise—where the highest state, the unitive, is enjoyed by the soul—that he incurred expulsion from the vision-land. His act of contrition and of humility followed promptly (1189-1194) : 'Had I always bent to that Prince's Will, and yearned for no more than was granted to me, and kept myself there (i. e., on the hither side of the dividing stream) as the pearl that was so blessed (i. e., the vision-soul) exhorted me, thus disposed,¹² drawn to God's Presence, to more of His mysteries I should have been led.'

Fenimore, "A Monetary Question in *Gautier D'Aupais?*" *MLN.*, LV (1940), 338-42. For *-er* and *-ur* in words of French origin, v. *supra*, n. 3, *synglure*.

¹² MS. *helde*, pp. of *helden*, defined in *Prompt. Parv.* 'inclino,' may repeat the idea of *bente* (1189) or express a common meaning even of classical Latin, 'favorably disposed.' The form, *helde*, is the regular preterite. The final *-d*, even if the participle required it, could be dropped here in accordance with the usage of NWM dialect, especially in this poem. Cf. *hope*, 185. Gollancz glosses *helde* as the adv., 'likely,' Lancas. dialect, though, as he says, it is not found in ME. Osgood emends *held[r]*, 'rather.'

Man is wont, he continues, to grasp at more than justly belongs to him (1195-96). There is such a thing as covetousness even in spiritualities. For this fault he, the jeweler, was cast out from regions that last forever. Thus Heaven is not to be secured by presumption or by opposition to God's Will (1199-1200) but by co-operation. This co-operation is evidenced by those who reject the thraldom, the love-dominion (*luf-daungere*, 11)¹³ of earthly goods, purchasing by renunciation of such inordinate attachment to them, that flawless pearl (743-44), eternal happiness. This teaching, as has been already said, belongs to the centuries—even to the twentieth.¹⁴

SISTER MARY VINCENT HILLMANN

College of St. Elizabeth

MODERN TEXTUAL CORRUPTION IN MS CAMBRIDGE ADDITIONAL 3470

When John Bale quotes the *Catalogus scriptorum* of Boston of Bury, he often differs from the text as it survives in the single extant manuscript, MS Additional 3470 in the University Library at Cambridge (MS A), which was transcribed about 1700 for Thomas Tanner.¹ The editors of Bale's notebook compare his quotations from Boston of Bury with the extracts from MS A in the introduction to Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* and point out many discrepancies, but make no reference to the fact that any medieval text which, like Boston's *Catalogus*, survives in a unique modern manuscript, will usually prove to have been revised

¹³ *luf-daungere*, Gollancz (ed. 1921) unjustifiably translates 'Severing Love,' which, he says (*op. cit.*, n. 11) means 'God's Will.' Thus he quite reverses the sense of the line, and, at the very outset, blurs the theme of the poem.

¹⁴ Cf. Dom Gaspar Lefebvre, O. S. B., *Saint Andrew Missal* (St. Paul, Minn., 1937), p. 1511: 'The Duke (St. Hedwig's husband) having died, Hedwig, like the merchant mentioned in the Gospel, gave away all her riches to acquire the precious pearl of eternal life.'

¹ The MS is inscribed on a flyleaf, "To the Rev'd Dr Tanner, Chancellor in Norwich." The date is earlier than Thomas Hearne's reference to Tanner's transcript, September 22, 1709, in his *Collections*, Oxford Historical Society, II (Oxford, 1886), ed. C. E. Doble, p. 24.

in modern times if it can be put to a test. Bale cites his manuscript of the *Catalogus* as belonging to Aylotus Holte Buriensis,² the same person doubtless as Ailot Halstede alias Holte who was pensioned as a monk of St. Edmund's, Bury, at the dissolution of the monasteries.³ Evidently after Holte had left the abbey he had in his possession the manuscript of Boston's *Catalogus* which had formerly belonged to the Bury abbey library, presumably Boston's autograph and the only medieval copy, for Bale would have known of any other through Holte. The MS was apparently one of the books which Bale left behind in Ireland when he went into exile. In the seventeenth century it was in the possession of James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh (d. 1656), and of Thomas Gale in Tanner's time, and it was known to other scholars.⁴ Hearne notes hearsay that the MS "whence Dr Tanner took his transcript" was in the hands of John and Awnsham Churchill, the London booksellers, and nothing further is known of it.⁵ The material in Bale's notebook is the nearest we have to the original manuscript.

Bale quotes only a few fragments of the *Catalogus*,⁶ but he includes authors who are not in the excerpts in Tanner's *Bibliotheca* except for their names, and some who are left out altogether.⁷ And the text of the *Catalogus* as it appears in the *Bibliotheca* includes authors and titles and other matter not in the *Catalogus*.

² John Bale, *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, ed. R. L. Poole and Mary Bateson (Oxford, 1902), p. 49.

³ *Letters and papers of Henry VIII*, xiv (1539), part II, no. 462, p. 168.

⁴ Thomas Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica sive de scriptoribus*, ed. David Wilkins (London, 1748), in his account of Boston of Bury. For references to other scholars who knew the *Catalogus*, see E. A. Savage, "Notes on the early monastic libraries of Scotland with an account of the *Registrum Librorum Angliae . . .*" in the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, *Papers*, xiv (1930), 1 ff.

⁵ Hearne as in note 1 above, vii, 24, June 29, 1719, and ix, September 11, 1725.

⁶ Out of 670-odd entries in MS A, as in Tanner's *Bibliotheca*, pp. xvii-xliii, about 107 are quoted by Bale.

⁷ All the authors in Bale's excerpts are in MS A, including Columban and Nicholas Byard. Ricardus de Pratellis and Robert de Mt Michaelis are said to be from Boston of Bury in Bale's second edition of his *Summarium scriptorum* (Basel, 1557-9), pp. 131-2, but Ricardus de Pratellis is now only in the summary list of authors at the end of the *Catalogus* in MS A, and the excerpt on Robert de Mt Michaelis is identical with that from the Norwich catalogue; cf. note 15 below.

itself but only in the extensive marginalia in MS A, which an eighteenth century annotator copied from the kindred text in MS Tanner 165 in the Bodleian Library (MS T) entitled *Registrum Angliae de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*, a thirteenth century compilation of the English Franciscans sometimes called *Tabula septem custodiarum fratrum minorum*⁸ and Boston's model and chief source in his record of libraries.⁹ The annotator compared the two catalogues with care, marking titles in MS A which are in MS T, and interpolating supplementary matter from MS T in the margins and between the lines of MS A, wherever he could crowd it in, usually in brackets or with the citation *MS S* or *S* meaning MS Sancroft as MS T was then called;¹⁰ but although the annotations are obviously insertions and in a hand distinctly not that of the scribe, these marks of differentiation are ignored in the *Bibliotheca*, and the brackets and citations are often omitted, so that the annotations are not always distinguishable from the text of the *Catalogus*. In short, for comparison with Bale's excerpts the *Bibliotheca* is not only scant but misleading.

If both MSS A and T are compared with Bale's excerpts,¹¹ however, traces of modern revision of the text of the *Catalogus* are quite clear. In Lanfranc, for instance, Bale parallels MS A closely except that he has the title, *Consuetudines monachorum*, which is not in MS A, although in Tanner's *Bibliotheca* the title, *Liber consuetudinarius*, is printed as though it were in the *Catalogus* while in reality it is an annotation from MS T.¹² That is, the

* This older catalogue is not to be confused with the Norwich catalogue which contained authors not in the *Registrum Angliae* and not in Boston. Henry Wharton misunderstood the *Registrum* as a short form of Boston's *Catalogus* (cf. Tanner on Boston of Bury), occasioning various mistaken statements, as in J. W. Thompson's *Medieval Library* (Chicago, 1939), p. 618, where Boston's *Catalogus* is described in terms of the *Registrum* more or less, with every detail erroneous.

⁸ M. R. James, "The list of libraries prefixed to the catalogue of John Boston of Bury and kindred documents," British Society of Franciscan Studies, x (London, 1922), 37 ff., A. G. Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History* (Manchester, 1917), pp. 164-7, 235-7.

⁹ Tanner on Boston of Bury.

¹⁰ Photostats are used here, by courtesy of the Bodleian and Cambridge libraries. For the photostats, acknowledgment is due the American Association of University Women.

¹¹ MS T, f. 117v: *Opera Lanfranci, Epistole eius, j. Contra Berengarium,*

title, *Consuetudines monachorum*, was originally in the *Catalogus* but had disappeared from the text before Tanner's time. The many other additional titles which Bale's editors point out in his excerpts from Boston,¹³ are all presumably authentic, though now lost from the text. For instance, his excerpt on Robert Grosseteste begins with the twelfth title in MS A, *Exameron*, which is followed by two titles not in MS A,—*Sermones*, with the incipit *Pauper inops laudabunt nomen*, and *de humilitate domini*,—while his fourth title is the second in MS A, *De originali peccato*, and the rest are all as in MS A and in the same order. In a few instances, the additional title occurs in MS A but in a different part of the text. For instance, where MS A has an entry for *Wilhelmus Parvus* with the date 1197 and the title, *Super cantica canticorum* beginning *Crebra*, and another entry for *Wilhelmus Neuburgensis* with the date 1160 and the title, *Historia de gestis Anglorum* beginning *Historiam*, Bale has one excerpt with the name, *Wilhelmus Parvus Neuburgensis*, and the date 1160, and both titles with the same incipits; and where MS A has an entry for an author called *Gregorius post Guidonem* with one title, *De musica*, beginning *Debitum*, and also an entry for *Gregory of Bridlington* with one title only, *Super cantica canticorum*, Bale's excerpt on *Gregory of Bridlington* includes both these titles, and there is nothing in his notebook on the other *Gregory*.¹⁴ Is he combining material from two separate entries in these excerpts? He does this where he adds to his excerpt on *Guido de Columpnis* a sentence from the *Dares Frigius* entry in MS A. But even here he holds to the information in Boston of Bury and does not add to it. He never, in *Guido* or elsewhere in the notebook, deliberately emends Boston of Bury in ascription or any other matter, so that there is no ground to suppose that he turned to other sources for authority to attribute the *De musica* to *Bridlington* and to identify Newburg with *Wilhelmus Parvus*, as would have been necessary if he had found these authors in his copy of the *Catalogus* as they are in MS A.

105. 9. j. 20. 53. xxiiii. xv. *Regula eiusdem*, 8. *Liber consuetudinarius*, 81.
De corpore et sanguine domini, 15. 1.

¹³ Cf. Gervase of Tilbury, Walter Bokedene, Walter of Exeter, William de Altone, John of Cornwall, Osborn of Canterbury, and Warner, and note 16 below.

¹⁴ See also the two entries, Robert Holcote and Holcote in Boston of Bury, and Robert Molindensis and Bale's Robert Criklaide and Robert Loreyn.

Bale usually marks his excerpts from Boston with the citation phrase, *Ex catalogo Bostoni Buriensis*; but he sometimes quotes a passage from Boston of Bury which he found also in a catalogue from Norwich not otherwise known but evidently in part a parallel text, and here he uses the phrase, *Ex utroque catalogo Nordovicensi et Buriensi* or *Ex utroque Anglorum catalogo*.¹⁵ All the authors in these excerpts are in MS A (but not in MS T) and mainly as in Bale.¹⁶ Bale's form is different, for he usually omits Boston's elaborate headings except for the date which he places at the end. His incipits are often longer¹⁷ and he has no explicits, and almost none of the library record. And there are countless slight variations in diction, word-order, syntax, and the like, in his excerpts. Except for these characteristic differences, he is usually in short entries in close agreement with MS A, as, for example, in Radulphus Niger, where he has the same titles in the same order and with the same incipits, though without explicits, while MS A is corroborated by

¹⁵ According to Bale's notebook there were authors in Boston of Bury not in the Norwich catalogue, and authors in the Norwich catalogue not in Boston, but see note 7 above on Robert de Mt Michaelis which suggests that Boston did not always trouble to cite both catalogues where he found them in agreement.

¹⁶ Bale agrees with MS A except in these particulars: 1) Where the citation phrase is *Ex utroque Nord. et Bur.*, in the excerpt on Abbo he adds four incipits, on Alred of Rievaulx, two titles, *De adventu domini* and *Dialogus*, both in MS T, and two incipits, omitting one title and two incipits, on Nequam, one title, *de assumptione*, with minor variations in the heading, longer incipits, and omission of two titles, on Alcuin, see below note 20 and accompanying text; 2) where the citation phrase is *Ex utroque Anglorum catalogo*, he adds, in the excerpt on Adelard of Bath, one title, *Questiones naturales*, on Arnulphus, one title, *Disputationes*, and lacks the identification with Ernulphus of Rochester though it is in Bale's *Summarium scriptorum*, on Bede, he adds three titles, all in MS T, *De purgatorio Patritii*, *De ponderibus et mensuris*, and *Exameron*, omits many titles, and has longer incipits, on Henry Costessey, he adds the date and extends the incipit, on Johannes Scotus, he adds the detail that John's *De eucharistia* was condemned at the Council of Vercelli, which is in Boston's cited source, Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum Historiale*, xxiv, 42 (in Boston of Bury by error xxviii, 83), on Robert of Oxford he parallels the entry for Robertus Molinensis in MS A, omitting two titles and differing in the order. Wherever MS T is paralleled in Bale but not in MS A, Bale is corroborated by MS T.

¹⁷ Cf. in Bale's notebook, the editors' note on Osbert of Clare that the incipits are extended in different ink.

Boston's cited source, Niger's own canon of his works in his *Chronicon*; or as in Leporius, where Bale reproduces the entry in MS A which is a paraphrase of Gennadius in his continuation of Jerome's *de viris illustribus*.¹⁸ Where the entry in the *Catalogus* is long, Bale often selects, but he still follows MS A closely, as in Richard de St Victor or Anselm.¹⁹ Sometimes he seems to simplify a wordy passage, as in Alcuin, where, though he lacks half of Boston's titles, everything he has is in MS A in the same order, both the titles and the long heading which is marked by two striking peculiarities, viz. the identification of Alcuin with Albinus of Canterbury, Bede's contemporary, and a long quotation from Boston's chief source in this entry, the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais, xxiv, 173.²⁰ Sometimes Bale's minute differences are so distinctive as to seem authentic, as in the excerpt on Edmund Rich, *Edmundus Abendonensis archiepiscopus Cantuariae scripsit contemplande dietatis Speculum*, instead of the fragmentary passage in MS A in which the scribe was apparently unable to make out his copy, *Edius archiepiscopus Cantuariae floruit A. Ch. et scripsit Librum qui vocatur Speculum Edi*, or in the excerpt on Johannes Scotus, where Bale preserves matter which is in Boston's source, Vincent of Beauvais, and so was undoubtedly in Boston originally but is not in MS A.²¹

There is little or nothing in MS A to indicate that the scribe observed differences in ink or handwriting or any other evidences of revision. After the Arnulphus entry there is a note in the scribe's hand that part of the entry is in a "recent hand," but this may have been in his copy.²² Another passage in MS A is obviously alien, and it is not in Tanner's *Bibliotheca*, viz. *Houden scripsit de processu Christi et redemptionis nostrae, Ave verbum . . . verbum ens in principia. Est inter fratres Min. Norwic.* This is at the end

¹⁸ Niger, *Chronicon*, ed. Robert Anstruther, Caxton Society (London, 1851), p. 97, and Gennadius, no. 59, and MS A: Leporius Monachus et Presbyter praesumens de puritate vitae Pelagianum dogma caeperat sequi sed per B. Augustinum admonitus et emendatus scripsit de emendatione sua libellum, 1. Item, de incarnatione Christi, li. 1.

¹⁹ Cf. Tanner's *Bibliotheca*.

²⁰ See above note 16.

²¹ See note 16 above.

²² The note, very faint in the photostat, reads, NB. Quae hic mini[o] subnotantur manu recenti inferuntur.

of the section for authors whose names begin with H. What marks it as certainly alien is the source of information, a manuscript at the Franciscan priory at Norwich, for this is not one of the libraries in the preliminary key list of libraries either in Boston's *Catalogus* or in the *Registrum Angliae*, so that it has no number and is therefore mentioned here by name, and it does not occur at all in MS T nor elsewhere in MS A. But this passage appears verbatim in Bale's notebook, except that the citation phrase is *Ex Minoritis Nordovici*, so that the source is not Boston of Bury but, as in MS A, a manuscript belonging to the Franciscan priory at Norwich. It seems likely that this interpolation in MS A originated with Bale himself.

Thus Bale has preserved slight but conclusive evidence of revision of the text of the *Catalogus* of Boston of Bury in modern times. In quoting from Boston where he is borrowing from such sources as Vincent of Beauvais or Gennadius, Bale witnesses the authenticity of all material in MS A from these sources; but to reconstruct the text, the very same manuscripts of these sources which Boston used would be necessary, and at present it is not known whether they exist.

RAMONA BRESSIE

Chicago, Illinois

‘HUDIBRAS’ BUTLER ABROAD

The Duke of Buckingham was sent on a diplomatic mission to France in the summer of 1670. Accompanied by Buckhurst and Sedley, he was immediately preceded or followed—the records are not clear—by a distinguished entourage which is said to have included the historian of the Royal Society Thomas Sprat, the comedian Joe Haines, and the satirist Samuel Butler.¹ Although, apparently, V. de Sola Pinto was certain of Butler’s presence in Buckingham’s suite, it has never been satisfactorily proved. The last person publicly to doubt it was E. S. de Beer, who wrote,

I have been unable to look up Mr. Pinto’s references to the papers in the Archives étrangères. Of the other documents to which Mr. Pinto refers the letters in the State Papers, France (Public Record Office), alone mention

¹ V. de Sola Pinto, *Sir Charles Sedley* (New York, 1927), p. 114.

a “Mr. Butler.” Unless the papers in the Archives étrangères are more explicit the question of identification must remain open.²

At the moment, of course, the Archives étrangères cannot be consulted. However, a section of the commonplace book Butler kept between 1650 and 1680 provides almost incontrovertible, if circumstantial, evidence for Mr. Pinto’s contention.³

At the beginning of the book appear several pages which Butler devoted to observations on France and the French and to an English-French dictionary. Happily, he set down among the observations some which make it possible for the opening section to be dated with relative precision. “The present King [Louis XIV] is building a most Stately Triumphall Arch (which is called a triumphall arch) in memory of his victories and the great actions which hee has performed. . . .” And further,

Hee is now building a magnificent fabrick upon a Hill without the towne [Paris] which hee pretends to bee a Colledge for Astronomers & builds it High that they may have a freer prospect of the Heavens from all parts. But the Strength and fortification of the design of It makes It plaine that hee intends it for a Castle to overtop and command all parts of the Citty & to have a free view of all the Houses in that Rather than those in the Heavens

These suspicions of Butler’s were ill founded; the castle-like structure really was an observatory for the stars. The arch was unquestionably the Arc de Triomphe du Trône set up in the Faubourg S. Antoine to celebrate the victories of Louis XIV in Flanders and la Franche-Comté in 1666-1667. Designed by Claude Perrault, it was partially erected between 1668 and 1680 when construction finally stopped altogether; very little work, however, was done after 1670. The Observatory—so it was actually called—was also designed by Perrault. On a site selected by the most prominent astronomers in Paris, the building was begun in 1667 and com-

² E. S. de Beer, “The Later Life of Samuel Butler,” *RES.*, iv (1928), 164.

³ Butler’s commonplace book was lost to the academic world between 1793, when Treadway Russel Nash brought out his edition of *Hudibras*, and 1941, when Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach listed it in his catalogue of *English Poetry to 1700*; as a result, only a small part of it has ever been published and its contents are relatively unknown.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Rosenbach and Mr. John Fleming for permitting me to use the manuscript in the preparation of a doctoral dissertation and this article. It is pleasant to be able to record here my appreciation to both.

pleted five years later.⁴ Obviously, since it was unfinished when Butler described it, he must have done so before 1672.⁵ Since, moreover, the first entry of payment for both the Observatory and the Arc de Triomphe is dated 1669, it is unlikely that Butler's references were set down earlier.⁶ If Butler did make the trip to France then, there is small reason to doubt that he did so in 1670.⁷

But did he make the trip? The English-French dictionary leads one to the affirmative answer as do his Gallic observations, by reason of their number, isolation, and content. Many of them, indeed, sound amusingly like the prejudiced mutterings of a typically provincial tourist. In point of fact, Butler's impressions of France, often interesting *per se*, show his insularity to have somewhat beclouded his perceptions.⁸ Though he made no mention of Molière, Racine, and Corneille, for example, he yet maintained that the "Theaters & Stages & Actors [of the French] are most intellerable, in Comparison of ours: & their musick much worse than punchinello's." And he rambled on at length about playhouses and diction.

Their Pitts are made [of] Shelving, like ours: but without Seates, which makes them stand very uneasily: & to save their money, Buy pleasure with Paine.

⁴ Sir Reginald Blomfield, *A History of French Architecture* (London, 1921), I, 84 f.

⁵ On the basis of the arch passage from Butler's commonplace book which Nash quoted in his edition of *Hudibras*, Jan Veldkamp believed that Butler visited France and dated the trip 1673, assuming that the arch was the Porte Saint-Denis and that it was near completion since Butler called it "stately." This arch was built in 1672-1673, but, as Veldkamp acknowledges, Butler apparently knew of no arches honoring the king which were built before the one he spoke of. Veldkamp, *Samuel Butler* (Hilversum, 1923), p. 210, n. 2.

⁶ Blomfield, *op. cit.*, p. 84, n. 1, apparently quoting "Blondel, 'Arch. Franc.', 11, 57."

⁷ The fact that Butler's "Ode on Claude du Val, the [French] Highwayman" was published in 1671 suggests that Butler's visit to France, if he made one, were in 1670 or early 1671. On the other hand, it is true that du Val actually worked in England and was hanged at Tyburn. A trip to France, however, might have stimulated Butler's interest in French nationals, particularly those who were notorious!

⁸ All the following quotations save the one referred to in note 10 are from unnumbered pages in Butler's commonplace book; they have not been published before. For a complete picture of Butler's impressions of France, see also the observations quoted by Nash in his edition of *Hudibras*.

They have no manner of passion in their pronunciation, nor change of their voyces according to the Sense: But run on as they used to doe in Speaking & make a short stop at every Rhime which is most Lewd & ridiculous for without Cadence & Accent, in pronunciation the best Sense cannot but lose much of its grace and Elegance, in any Language, But the French who use to pronounce a whole Line without any distinction, as if it were all but one word; lose that Advantage of Humouring Sence (if they had it) which other more Sober & Significant Languages, never omitt.⁹

It is entertaining, when one considers the English language, to find Butler criticizing the French also on the grounds that “for pronouncing words otherwise then They are written they make the most confounded Stuff in the world.”

Butler was evidently not altogether at home in an alien tongue. Yet his English-French dictionary, although it was never completed, shows that he did make an effort to understand. Even so we are not surprised to find him complaining, “The French use so many words upon all occasions that if they did not cut them so Short in pronunciation that they are allmost Inarticulate, They would grow tedious & insufferable.”¹⁰ And “when they meete in Conversation they all (like Jackdaws & Rookes) chatter rather then talk together & no man minds what another saies because he knows before Hand, that it is not worth his attention.” Further, “*every man has a speciall Regard to what Hee sayes Himselfe; but none at all to what he heares from others:* And by these meanes They are all better pleased, then if they talkd ever so much to the purpose.” Again, the French

are naturally *so Incontinent of their Tongue* that there is nothing so uneasy to Them as to be Silent. Their Loquacity is so naturall to them, that whosoever has to do with any of them; though in the smallest matter Imaginable shall never come off without a long Dispute & wrangling

Apparently, Butler, who was perhaps himself also naturally loquacious, was pained almost beyond endurance by French garrulity, for he recurred on several occasions to the subject, even declaring that

⁹ In his edition of *Hudibras* (New York, 1847), p. 15, Nash gives the following passage from the commonplace book: “They find it much easier to write playes in verse then in Prose, for it is much harder to imitate nature then any Deviation from Her; *And Prose* requires a more proper & naturall sense & expression; then verse; that has Something in the Stamp & Coyne to answer for the Alloy & want of the Intrinsiq value.” It is to be found in the French section of Butler’s manuscript.

¹⁰ Nash quoted this complaint in his *Hudibras*, p. 15.

when finally the French become speechless, their physicians realize death can no longer be kept away.

Quite probably, the provincial Butler found himself gulled by French tradesmen. He maintained, at least, that "in Paris they gaine most by Cheating of Strangers either in the Price of whatsoever they have occasion for, or the fantastique value of their money which they reckon by *livers*, *Though they have no such Coin in the World.*" He even came to feel that "the French nation is like a Tavern to the English that drink up their wines & are ever wrongd & Cheated by Them." However, he asserted also,

Nothing does more demonstrate their poverty then the Baseness of their *money* the most common being of Alloyd & debased Brasse. And the difference that is between the *Coyn* (which is the common measure of all things) of the 2 nations seemes to bee the very same in Every thing else.

Moreover, "there is nothing Great nor magnificent in all the Country (that I have seen) but the building & furniture of the King's houses & the Churches; All the rest is mean & paltry, The shops little & dark & poorly furnished with wares." Not without some significance is the allusion to "*the King's houses*," which a member of Buckingham's suite would have been sure to visit. Still more important is the parenthetical "that I have seen." It is as close as Butler ever approached to stating explicitly that he made a trip to the continent.

But nearly all Butler's observations are those of an eyewitness. Without doubt, three of them in particular are derived mainly from personal experiences in Parisian streets. There his attention was evidently drawn to lawyers and ladies, both of whom provoked him to record the impressions they produced. Of the former, he wrote:

The Lawyers seeme to bee more Numerous then ours at London For though in the vacation of the parliament[?] the pallace was fuller upon a small Court day then ever I saw Westminster Hall in full terme.¹¹ They walk the Streets in great state & Every man has his Lacquey or two to bear up the taile of his Gowne They plead at the Barr in the same fashioned Capes that priests wear in Procession. Both they and their Clyents must of necessity bee admirably Litigious That doe so naturally abound with words & their own Sence. all trades sett up among them as

¹¹ If Butler did visit France as a member of Buckingham's entourage, he left England in July and returned in September. The Parliament of Paris was on vacation throughout September.

they do with us to shew that Justice Itself is but a Commodity & to be bought & Sold to Him that will give most.

Butler's attitude toward the ladies was decidedly ungallant. Said he,

If the Citty of Paris were far more Beautiful then It is; It wants one ornament with which London abounds; Beautiful women, that are the greatest rarities in the world in Paris & make It looke like a great fair House Ill furnished: For those that have not Seen It cannot fancy How unpleasant it is to find a perpetuall defect of those objects which all men naturally take delight to looke upon; & which are so common with us that we take no notice of Them untill by the want of them, wee find how uncomfortable a Great Citty appears without Them. *For the same things that Excellent pictures are to Galleryes Beautiful women are to Streets.*

Although most of Butler's judgments are derogatory, he did pay one tribute to Paris, to Louis XIV, and to France: "And indeed it is Wonderfull to what a great Quietnesse hee has reduced the one halfe of it [Paris] i. e. the filous That used to gouern as freely in the night as the Magistrates did in the day: for there is no Citty in the world that is freer from those people nor any Country in which the High wayes are Safer." Surely no man could make such statements as these if he had not himself observed the streets and highways of both the English and the French. It is safe, therefore, to conclude that in 1670 a somewhat prejudiced, if intellectually curious, Samuel Butler did embark for France.

NORMA E. BENTLEY

Syracuse University

SWIFT AND SIR WILLIAM TEMPLE—A CONJECTURE

Swift, in his correspondence, frequently refers to the two illnesses which plagued him recurrently from his young manhood onward—giddiness and deafness. In his later years he sometimes referred to the events which he supposed to be the causes of these misfortunes. During his last visit to England, in the course of a light-hearted exchange of letters with Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk, he wrote:

Twickenham, August 19, 1727.

Madam,

About two hours before you were born I got my giddiness, by

eating a hundred golden pippins at a time at Richmond; and when you were four years and a quarter old bating two days, having made a fine seat about twenty miles farther in Surrey, where I used to read and sleep, there I got my deafness: . . .¹

In his fragmentary autobiography, written at about the same period, Swift said,

The troubles then [1688-9] breaking out, he [Swift] went to his mother, who lived in Leicester; and after continuing there some months, he was received by Sir William Temple, whose father had been a great friend to the family, and who was now retired to his house called Moor Park, near Farnham in Surrey; where he continued for about two years. For he happened before twenty years old, by a surfeit of fruit to contract a giddiness and coldness of stomach, that almost brought him to his grave; and this disorder pursued him with intermissions of two or three years to the end of his life. Upon this occasion he returned to Ireland by advice of physicians, who weakly imagined that his native air might be of some use to recover his health; but growing worse, he soon went back to Sir William Temple; . . .²

About 1738 Swift, or another (possibly Dr. John Lyon at Swift's direction), added the words "in 1690" after the phrase "returned to Ireland."

Finally, in a letter to William Richardson, dated April 30, 1737, Swift wrote, "In England, before I was twenty, I got a cold which gave me a deafness that I could never clear myself of."³

It has been held that these three statements by Swift about his illnesses are inconsistent. We know that at the age of twenty-one, about the beginning of the year 1689, he left Dublin; that after visiting his mother in Leicestershire he joined the household of Sir William Temple at Moor Park in Surrey; and that in the summer of 1690 he went back to Ireland, where he stayed a year and a half before returning to England.⁴ If, then, the "surfeit of fruit" occurred after he joined Temple's household at Moor Park it did not take place "before twenty years old," nor, presumably, did it take place at Richmond, if we assume, as all biographers do, that by Richmond Swift meant Temple's estate at Sheen, which Temple had given to his son John in 1688. Various interpretations have

¹ *Correspondence of Jonathan Swift* (ed. Elrington Ball), London, 1910, 3, 413-14.

² Forster, John, *Life of Jonathan Swift*, London, 1875, p. 13.

³ *Correspondence* (ed. Ball), 6, 13.

⁴ *Correspondence* (ed. Ball), 1, 2 and note 1: 1, 3, note 3.

been put upon Swift's statements: some biographers have dated the "surfeit" in 1689, ignoring the words "before twenty"; others have accepted "before twenty" and have located the "surfeit" in Ireland rather than in Richmond. There is an additional contradiction in the 1737 letter, where Swift assigns the cold that caused his deafness, instead of the surfeit that caused his giddiness, to the period before he was twenty, though in the 1727 letter he has the deafness beginning when he was about twenty-four.

The last inconsistency is so undeniable that it must be attributed to Swift's failing memory. But it must be remembered that that memory did not begin to deteriorate noticeably until about 1730,⁵ at the earliest, so that its failure does not provide a very satisfactory explanation of the discrepancies between the two statements made in or near 1727.

One biographer of Swift, however, has let fall a chance remark which may shed some light on the problem. In a note to a discussion of the origins of Swift's illnesses Forster remarks casually,

That the illness [giddiness] began in England he repeated ten years later [than 1727]; and if his memory is not at fault in the date given here, it must have happened during one of his boy-visits to his mother.*

This is the only reference to these "boy-visits" by Forster or anyone else. What, if any evidence is there that such visits ever took place? Elsewhere, and in another connection, Forster mentions an entry in one of Swift's notebooks which speaks of his voyage from England to Ireland in the spring of 1704 as his tenth voyage between the two countries.⁷ Ball comments that this must be a mistake, since fourteen voyages are known up to this date—two in Swift's infancy, when he was carried away by his nurse, six in connection with his three visits to Temple, and two each in 1701, 1702, and 1703-4. He also notes that Lyon speaks of this last as Swift's sixteenth voyage (ostensibly relying on the same notebook entry), and suggests that Forster misread "10th" for "16th."⁸ It is possible that Forster was right, however, and that by a voyage

* See *Correspondence* (ed. Ball), passages cited in index under Swift, gradual loss of memory, 6.370, col. 1.

⁵ Forster, *Life of Swift*, p. 48, note.

⁷ Forster, *Life of Swift*, p. 131.

⁸ *Correspondence* (ed. Ball), 1.48, note 1.

between the two countries Swift meant a voyage to and from England. In this event there would have been twenty single voyages, with six unaccounted for. If Lyon was right, two voyages would be unaccounted for. In either event there would be a strong case for at least one "boy-visit." Nor is Swift's failure to refer to it in the autobiography significant: there would have been no place in that concise document for the chronicling of boyhood vacations.

The next question is the date of the visit on which the "surfeit of fruit" may have occurred. There are good reasons for putting it late in Swift's youth. The older he became the more able he would have been to make such a journey unattended. And the statement that the surfeit occurred before Swift was twenty suggests by its phraseology that it was not long before his twentieth birthday (November 30, 1687), while the repetition of the statement ten years later, though now transferred to the inception of the deafness, shows how deep an impression the incident had made on his mind.⁹ It seems unlikely that he was very much less than twenty at the time of which he spoke.

There are additional clues in the letter to the Countess in which Swift places the surfeit and the cold four and a quarter years apart, the first having taken place at Sheen, the second at Moor Park. It is important to establish, if possible, the dates of Temple's residence at each place. He appears to have moved to Moor Park in November, 1686, to have returned temporarily to Sheen (which he had given to his son John) at the outbreak of the Revolution (i. e., not long after November 5, 1688), and not to have returned to Moor Park until late in 1689.¹⁰ Unfortunately some of these dates depend on the testimony of his sister, who was notoriously inaccurate in such matters.¹¹ Everything would, of course, be much

⁹ Forster, *Life of Swift*, p. 49, remarks of this episode that it so impressed Swift that for the rest of his life he refrained from eating fruit, though he was passionately fond of it.

¹⁰ Woodbridge, Homer E., *Sir William Temple*, London, 1940, pp. 214, 216.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 220. An example of this inaccuracy which apparently has not been remarked is the statement that Sir William on his way from Sheen to Moor Park, which he reached in November, 1686, visited King James at Windsor. The *London Gazette* for September 30-October 4, 1686, announces that the King and Queen returned from Windsor to London on October 1, and subsequent issues show that the King remained in London at least until the end of December.

simpler if we knew the date of the birth of the Countess of Suffolk, or at least what Swift believed it to be. The tone of his letter to the Countess suggests that this subject had been discussed by them recently, and perhaps that her birthday came at a time of year not far from the date of his letter, August 19. Unfortunately, however, both the day and the year of the Countess' birth are unknown. The year is commonly given as 1681; it is so stated in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.¹² Apparently the only authority ever given for this date is the *Gentleman's Magazine* for July, 1767, which, in listing the deaths of the month gives the age of 86 for the Countess.¹³ There seems to be nothing behind this more authoritative than items in various London daily papers (the earliest I have found is in *Lloyd's Evening Post* for July 27-29, 1767) to the effect that the Countess died "at her seat at Marble-Hill, near Richmond, in the 86th year of her age." Both statements seem to be wrong, however, as the parents of the Countess were married in 1684¹⁴ and there is no indication of any scandal connected with her birth. Horace Walpole, a close friend of the Countess in her later life, gives her age as 79 at the time of her death.¹⁵ Lord Hervey says she was about forty when George II succeeded to the throne (June 11, 1727),¹⁶ and Lady Betty Germaine, an intimate friend of the Countess and sister of her second husband, the Hon. George Berkeley, says that she was four or five years older—"no more"—than that gentleman,¹⁷ who was born in or about 1693.¹⁸ These three independent witnesses would place the birth date of the Countess near 1687 or 1688.

Putting all these facts together we begin to focus on the late summer or early fall of 1687 as the date of the Countess' birth. The time of year is supported by the fact that Swift could not easily have visited England during his college years except in

¹² Rigg, J. M., *Henrietta Howard*, DNB., 28. 22.

¹³ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 37. 383 (July, 1767).

¹⁴ Benjamin, Lewis S. *Lady Suffolk and her Circle*, London, 1924, pp. 2-3.

¹⁵ *The Letters of Horace Walpole* (ed. Mrs. Paget Toynbee), London, 1903-5, 7. 124-25.

¹⁶ Hervey, John Hervey, Lord, *Some Materials toward Memoirs*, London, 1931, 1. 42.

¹⁷ *Correspondence of Swift* (ed. Ball), 5. 205.

¹⁸ Cooper, Thompson, *George Berkeley*, DNB., 4. 348.

summer vacation, and the surfeit presumably took place in an orchard when the apples were approaching ripeness. As for the precise year, 1687 would agree exactly with Walpole's statement and closely with Hervey's and Lady Betty Germaine's estimates. It was also the year in the late fall of which Swift became twenty. And the approximate concurrence of the Countess' fortieth birthday with Swift's sixtieth in 1727 would have supplied a good reason for Swift's references in his letter.

How does all this agree with Swift's known movements? Could he have "made a fine seat" at Moor Park four and a quarter years after the summer of 1687? Writing from Moor Park to the Rev. John Kendall on February 11, 1691-2, Swift refers to the seven weeks he has been there.¹⁹ This can hardly carry his arrival farther back than December 22, 1691. "Four and a quarter years, bating two days" before this would have been September 24, 1687. As Swift would have been expected back in Trinity College on October 1²⁰ this would have been running it rather fine. On the other hand the golden pippins Swift mentions ripen late and are usually not eaten before November,²¹ so a late September date seems to be indicated. It appears that the Countess may well have been born on or about September 24, 1687, and that Swift had his surfeit of fruit on the same day.

In response to all of this the reader may properly inquire, "What of it?" Well, there are two not insignificant conclusions one might reach if all that has been suggested above is true. In the first place, it would help to substantiate the general trustworthiness of Swift's autobiographical statements. Secondly, it might help to explain Swift's attitude toward Temple in the early days of their relationship. Suppose Swift was sent to Sheen in the late summer of 1687 by his mother to secure a promise of some assistance from the Temple family in the matter of a future career, when the youth should have completed his education and obtained his master's degree. Suppose further that Swift raided the orchard at Sheen with the result he has recorded. Finally,

¹⁹ *Correspondence* (ed. Ball), 1. 4.

²⁰ Bolton, Robert, *A Translation of the Charter and Statutes of Trinity College, Dublin*, Dublin, 1749, p. 78.

²¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th ed., 1910), 2. 224 (*Apple*, by A. B. Renale).

suppose Swift returned to Ireland immediately after the episode, and did not return to England until the troubles in Ireland in 1689 forced him to cut short his studies while yet several months from his degree. Would he not naturally have been somewhat slow to present himself to the Temple family (he stayed some months at Leicester with his mother before going off to make his fortune)? Would he not have approached his patron with the shamefaced feeling that he was remembered as the immature boy who had made a pig of himself eating green apples? Would he not have interpreted Temple's natural reserve and coldness as special contempt for him and for his abilities? In the light of our knowledge of Swift's sensitiveness about his own dignity such a set of circumstances might account for much.

ARTHUR E. CASE

Northwestern University

EARLY CRITICISM OF POPE'S "NIGHT-PIECE"

In *Essays in Criticism and Research*, Geoffrey Tillotson states, "Coleridge, it seems, was the first to examine the 'popular lines' from Book VIII of the 'Iliad'—

As when the moon, resplendent lamp of night . . ."¹

It is doubtless true that the critics Tillotson cites, Coleridge, Southey, and Wordsworth,² were unprecedented in the vehemence with which they castigated the "night-piece" in Pope's Homer. Coleridge was not, however, the first "to examine" the passage as a hostile critic.

Samuel Say, in 1745, proposed a six-line version of the passage, a version half as long as Pope's, and in the same meter. He commented, "One line in Homer is thought sufficient to furnish more Verses in the Landskip, or Night-piece, given us by his Translator,

¹ Geoffrey Tillotson, *Essays in Criticism and Research* (Cambridge, 1942), pp. 68-9.

² Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria* (ed. J. Shawcross, Oxford, 1907), I, 26 n.-27 n.; Wordsworth, "Essay, Supplementary to the Preface," *Poems* (London, 1815), I, 358-9; Robert Southey, review of Chalmers' *Works of the English Poets*, *Quarterly Review*, XII (1814), 85-7.

than are to be found in the Whole *Simile* in the Original, which consists of no more than *Five Verses*; and, in a close Translation, might be comprised in the same number of Lines in English."³ Say did not indulge in more explicit criticism of Pope's lines. Almost thirty years later, Say's version reappeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine*.⁴ In a contribution devoted chiefly to Shakespeare's descriptions of night, one Q. had made the not uncommon remark that Pope's night-piece is "superior to the original."⁵ To this "Crito" took exception. He not only repeated (with acknowledgments) Say's comment to the effect that Pope had "paraphrastically expanded" five lines into twelve, and quoted Say's six-line translation, but added,

It is not only a paraphrase, but, through all the harmony of the versification, and brilliancy of the colouring, it is easy to discover some glaring blemishes, for which there is no warrant in the Greek. In particular, the splendor of the sun at noon-day could not be described more strongly than this moon-light is . . . and in the two last lines, by the introduction of *swains* in the plural number, the most striking allusion in the simile is lost; the *shepherd*, in the original, being Hector himself, the *pastor populorum* . . .⁶

An anonymous writer in the *London Magazine*, in 1782, cited Pope's night-piece as an illustration of his thesis that the ancients excel the moderns:

The former strike us with a fullness and energy, where the latter only struggle to amuse us with a finical arrangement, and a glittering phraseology. And here it may not be improper to observe, that rhyme . . . is unfriendly to the sublime style.⁷

In comment on Pope's passage, this critic said:

Though the translator has succeeded in no part of his work better than in this place, where he has lavished all the powers of expression, and pomp

³ Samuel Say, "Essay the Second," in *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1745), p. 156.

⁴ "Crito," "Objections to Pope's Translation of Homer's Night-Piece," *Gentleman's Magazine*, XLIV (1774), 77.

⁵ "Q." "Shakespeare's Description of Night Critically Considered," *ibid.*, 24.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 77. "Q." entered a rebuttal, pp. 164-5.

⁷ "On Sublimity in Literary Composition. A Fragment," *London Magazine*, LI (1782), 579.

of language, he renders that only beautiful which in the original is highly sublime. Indeed, the thoughts are preserved entire, but on comparison, you cannot help perceiving how much they are enervated, especially the conclusion of the passage, which, as Homer wrote it, is most plain and simple.⁸

Again, the *Monthly Magazine's* "Enquirer," in 1797, compared Pope's night-piece with Milton's description of night in Book iv of *Paradise Lost*, to the disadvantage of the former, which "loses some portion of the effect of imagery equally just and beautiful, by an unseasonable and incongruous mixture of the trivial and the playful."⁹ O. P. C., in the *European Magazine* for July, 1797, wrote a detailed comparison of Pope's lines with those of the original, and concluded, with apologetic praise of Pope: "the copy varies from the original, and does not so appositely answer the purpose, for which solely the simile is introduced."¹⁰ In this judgment he was seconded by J. D., who said, "No Ovidian graces or decorations will, in my opinion, atone for the majesty and noble simplicity of the Father of Poetry. . . . Homer's simplicity . . . is very poorly compensated by the luxuriance of Pope."¹¹ J. D. not only censured Pope's paraphrase as unfaithful to Homer but concluded, "Considering the passages with regard only to their respective beauty, the original is infinitely superior."¹²

I do not suggest that the influence or, indeed, the substantial originality of the Lake Poets' criticism has been overestimated, but that Coleridge's censure of Pope's night-piece was by no means wholly without precedent.

ALFRED C. AMES

Illinois Institute of Technology

⁸ *Ibid.*, 580.

⁹ "Is Rhyme an Ornament, or a Defect, in Verse?" *Monthly Magazine*, III (1797), 275-6.

¹⁰ O. P. C., "On Pope's Homer," *European Magazine*, XXXII (1797), 17.

¹¹ J. D., "To the Editor of the European Magazine," *ibid.*, 233.

¹² *Ibid.*, 234.

DR. JOHNSON AND BLAIR'S SERMONS

The Reverend Dr. Hugh Blair, who had long been admired as a preacher at Edinburgh, thought now of diffusing his excellent sermons more extensively, and increasing his reputation, by publishing a collection of them. He transmitted the manuscript to Mr. Strahan, the printer, who after keeping it for some time, wrote a letter to him, discouraging the publication. Such at first was the unpropitious state of one of the most successful theological books that has ever appeared. Mr. Strahan, however, had sent one of the sermons to Dr. Johnson for his opinion; and after his unfavourable letter to Dr. Blair had been sent off, he received from Johnson on Christmas-eve [1776], a note in which was the following paragraph:

‘I have read over Dr. Blair’s first sermon with more than approbation; to say it is good, is to say too little.’

I believe Mr. Strahan had very soon after this time a conversation with Dr. Johnson concerning them; and then he very candidly wrote again to Dr. Blair, enclosing Johnson’s note, and agreeing to purchase the volume, for which he and Mr. Cadell [his partner] gave one hundred pounds.¹

This story, as told by Boswell, is essentially true—so far at least as Dr. Johnson is concerned—but both the implication and the facts need qualification in the light of a letter hitherto overlooked.

The story implies that William Strahan, the publisher, had by himself been unable to perceive the merits of Blair’s sermons, and that, save for Johnson’s note of praise, they would not have been published. One cannot venture very far into such probabilities, but the fact remains that Blair’s sermons had already been sold for £100 and publication arrangements made before Strahan or Johnson had anything to say in the matter.

The letter which clears up the account is in the National Library of Scotland. It is dated “29 Oct^r 1776,” is written and signed in Blair’s hand, but does not, unfortunately, contain the name of the person addressed. That this person was William Strahan is, however, perfectly clear from a personal reference in the opening sentence, and from the way in which the letter as a whole fits into the pattern of things. Since the letter is short, I offer it complete:

Dear Sir

I was very glad to learn that my friend Mr Watson concluded with you upon terms which appear very fair to him and which I hope shall prove not

¹ Boswell’s *Johnson*, ed. Hill-Powell (Oxford, 1934), III, 97-98.

unprofitable to you.² I have my self at present in view a small publication in which it would give me pleasure that you were concerned, though it be of that kind on which I am afraid you will put no great value, being no other than a Volume of Sermons. All I can say for it is that I have employed more time & pains on them than I believe is commonly bestowed on publications of that Nature. As Sermons announced by The Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the University of Edinburgh may probably draw some Criticism I have given all the Attention that was in my power both to the Composition & the Style, and they have undergone the careful review of several of the best Judges here who would not wish my reputation to be endangered by them.

Mr Kincaid, our present Lord Provost,³ who is my old acquaintance & friend was very desirous of being concerned in the publication and offered me £100 for the Property which I have accepted. But both he and I wish very much that you were joined with him, in case the proposal suits you, and if he has not already written, he will soon write to you on the subject. I think I can flatter my self that in a reasonable time there will be a demand for another Edition. Mr Kincaid, out of favour to me, proposed to print at present only a small one; which as it will promote the Credit of the book by accelerating a new impression, may turn out no disadvantage to the Proprietors in the end. The sermons are mostly of a popular & sentimental kind; intermixed with one or two of a more philosophical cast. To send you specimens of so small a work I suppose would not have been worthwhile. I subjoin the subjects in case you have any desire to know them. Most sincerely I condole with you on the death of our excellent & amiable friend, Mr David Hume.

Following the closing regards, the signature, and the date, appears the list of sixteen titles which made up the first volume of Blair's *Sermons* as published in 1777.

It was, obviously, to split a publishing risk that Kincaid invited Strahan into the venture. Blair fell in with Kincaid's suggestion quite naturally, because he had nothing to lose and all to gain by having the London firm of Strahan and Cadell to distribute the sermons in England. Kincaid died on 21 January, 1777, and his contracts were taken over by William Creech. The *Sermons* appeared in Edinburgh on 8 February, 1777, under the imprint of Creech, and in London on 15 April under the combined imprints of Strahan, Cadell, and Creech. That the publishing contracts gave a third-interest to each of these men is affirmed by Blair's acknowledgement of a £50 gift in the following terms:

² Robert Watson, Professor of Logic at the University of St. Andrews, published a *History of Philip II of Spain* through Strahan in 1777.

³ More to the point was the fact that Alexander Kincaid was H. M. Printer and Stationer for Scotland.

I shall as you [Strahan] desire draw upon you by next post for £ 33-6-8d. which is Mr Cadell's share and yours.⁴

The immediate effect, then, of Johnson's Christmas-eve note praising Blair's sermons was to draw Strahan and Cadell into a publishing venture which proved to be one of the most profitable of the century.

ROBERT M. SCHMITZ

Washington University, St. Louis

KEATS AND COLERIDGE: "LA BELLE DAME SANS MERCI"

Among the many speculations about possible influences on "La Belle Dame Sans Merci" I have never seen Coleridge's "Love" mentioned; yet the song in that poem sung to Genevieve by her lover at least suggests a comparison. This song tells of a knight who for ten years loved without encouragement "the Lady of the Land." He was "crazed" by her "cruel scorn," seeing visions of an angel that was really a fiend. Then, still insane, he managed to save his Lady from "outrage worse than death," whereupon she repented of her coldness and nursed him back to sanity, only to see him die.

Although this story is not very much like Keats's, there are similar details besides the cruel lady and distracted knight. Coleridge's knight "pined," Keats's was "haggard" and "woe-begone." Coleridge's lady "nursed him [the knight] in a cave," where she "wept and clasped his knees"; Keats's "took me [again the knight] to her elfin grot," where she "wept and sighed full sore." In Keats's poem "the sedge is withered from the lake" and there are other signs of late autumn; in Coleridge's, "on the yellow forest leaves a dying man he lay." The similarity of feeling and atmosphere comes out especially in Coleridge's

⁴ Blair to Strahan, 3 August, 1779. MS. Dc. 2. 76. in the University of Edinburgh library. Blair received two such gifts from the publishers when they found themselves blessed with a "best seller" for which they had paid only £100. For the second volume Blair was paid £300, and for the third and fourth £600 each. The fifth and last volume was published posthumously in 1801.

That sometimes from the savage den,
And sometimes from the darksome shade,
And sometimes starting up at once
In green and sunny glade,—

There came and looked him in the face
An angel beautiful and bright;
And that he knew it was a Fiend,
This miserable Knight!

Another point of resemblance is that "Love," like "La Belle Dame," uses an abcb stanza of three four-stressed lines followed by a shortened fourth. The fourth line is not that of Keats, having three stresses instead of two; but it has a comparable effect of closing the stanza.

Possible external evidence of a relationship between the two poems lies in the fact that the journal-letter to George Keats which contains the earliest draft of "La Belle Dame" records, a few days before, Keats's well-known meeting with Coleridge.¹ They walked together, and Coleridge talked; among the topics Keats remembered were "Different genera and species of Dreams—Nightmare—a dream accompanied by a sense of touch—single and double touch—A dream related—... Monsters—the Kraken—Mermaids—... A Ghost story." It seems not unlikely that this encounter might have set Keats to reading Coleridge afresh, or at least to remembering his poems; and the sound and theme of "Love" might have struck new chords in his own mind. Even the talk about dreams and the supernatural might have borne fruit in "La Belle Dame Sans Merci."

In Keats's oft-quoted remarks about "Negative Capability," written more than a year before "La Belle Dame,"² the one example cited of the absence of this quality is "Coleridge, for instance, [who] would let go by a fine isolated verisimilitude caught from the Penetralium of mystery, from being incapable of remaining content with half-knowledge." Any reader of "Love" must notice the difference in tone between the part of the poem which I have been quoting and its framework of the uneventful love-story wherein a modern suitor wins his Genevieve in orthodox fashion,

¹ *Letters of John Keats*, ed. Maurice Buxton Forman, Oxford, 1931, II, 349-50.

² *Ibid.*, I, 77.

without benefit or hindrance of magic. However "exquisite"³ the stanzas may be, they lack the mystery which is a marked feature of Coleridge's best work. It seems possible that this was one of the poems giving rise to Keats's stricture; that the song about the knight might, in his opinion, have been better used for itself alone; and that months afterward, when he was again thinking of Coleridge, this remembered dissatisfaction had its part in the making of his own poem, in which the reader remains "content with half knowledge."

MARY REBECCA THAYER

The College of Wooster.

WORDSWORTH'S "TRAVELLING CRIPPLE"

In the seventh book of *The Prelude* Wordsworth referred to a beggar whose name and reputation are ascertainable:

As on the broadening causeway we advance,
Behold, turned upwards, a face hard and strong
In lineaments, and red with over-toil.
'Tis one encountered here and everywhere;
A travelling cripple, by the trunk cut short,
And stumping on his arms. . . . (199-204)

His "travelling cripple" was Samuel Horsey, King of the Beggars, whom he probably saw during his visits to London in 1791, when he spent three and one-half months there, at other times between 1793 and 1795, and in July and September, 1802. In April, October, and November, 1804, when he was composing Book VII, Wordsworth first wrote of Horsey; but his sketch, with very slight change, was not published until 1850.

Horsey is identified by an engraving dated August 30, 1803, and included in Kirby's *Wonderful and Eccentric Museum* (London, 1820), I, 331, with these accompanying words: "Samuel Horsey, aged fifty-five, a singular beggar in the Streets of London."¹ He is portrayed in impassioned words by Lamb in "A Complaint of the Decay of Beggars in the Metropolis," published in the

¹ See *Poems of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge, Oxford, 1912, 330 n.

² *Notes and Queries*, First Series, v (April 17, 1852), 376-7.

London Magazine, June, 1822. Nineteen years after the engraving was made and eighteen years after Wordsworth had written his first draft of his "travelling cripple," Samuel Horsey disappeared from the streets, and Lamb lamented his absence:

These dim eyes have in vain explored for some months past a well-known figure, or part of the figure, of a man, who used to glide his comely upper half over the pavements of London, wheeling along with most ingenious celerity upon a machine of wood; a spectacle to natives, to foreigners, and to children. He was of a robust make, with a florid sailor-like complexion, and his head was bare to the storm and sunshine. He was a natural curiosity, a speculation to the scientific, a prodigy to the simple. . . . Few but must have noticed him; for the accident, which brought him low, took place during the riots of 1780, and he has been a groundling so long. He seemed earth-born, an Antaeus, and to suck in fresh vigour from the soil which he neighboured. He was a grand fragment; as good as an Elgin marble. . . . The *os sublime* was not wanting; and he threw out yet a jolly countenance upon the heavens. Forty-and-two years had he driven this out of door trade, and now that his hair is grizzled in the service, but his good spirits no way impaired, because he is not content to exchange his free air and exercise for the restraints of a poor-house, he is expiating his contumacy in one of those houses (ironically christened) of Correction.

H. B. C. wrote in *Notes and Queries* (April 17, 1852) that he remembered Lamb's "sailor-looking man" in Fleet Street and the Strand and heard of his resistance when apprehended as a vagrant, probably about 1822. B. B., of Pembroke, in the same publication and of the same date, said he had heard from his father and from his grandfather (1) that Horsey was living in St. Mary-le-Strand in 1780 and could not, therefore, have been brought low during the riots of 1780; (2) that his legs were shot off by a cannon-ball; (3) that to each of his two daughters he gave a dowry of £500; (4) that he presided at a "cadger's club" at the head of a table with a wife on each side; (5) that he earned so much money he kept these two wives from quarreling; (6) that he was at one time a sailor; and (7) that he left a handsome sum of money when he died.

AUTREY NELL WILEY

The Texas State College for Women

A NOTE ON THE *SPECTATOR* 459

In the *Spectator* No. 459, writing on what we are to believe in religion and what we are to practice, Addison said: "But, to conclude with the Words of an Excellent Author, *We have just enough Religion to make us hate, but not enough to make us love one another.*" In his edition of the *Spectator*, Henry Morley remarked that the "Excellent Author" was "probably Tillotson," and G. Gregory Smith, in his edition, made the same identification.

Swift, however, expressed this thought exactly as quoted by Addison in the first of his "Thoughts on Various Subjects." As Dean Swift's work was printed in 1711 and the *Spectator* paper is dated August 16, 1712, it would seem probable that he is the "Excellent Author" Addison had in mind.

KATHRYN DAVIS

Tulane University

REVIEWS

Baudelaire: A Criticism. By JOSEPH D. BENNETT. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944. Pp. 165. \$2.00.

It is refreshing, after the welter of books on Baudelaire's life and character, his religious and aesthetic beliefs, his sources and his influence, to find one which deals directly with his poetry. When Mr. Bennett says that Kenneth Burke, in *Counter-Statement*, "was the only critic I found who dealt seriously with the technical and textual aspects of Baudelaire's poetry, and this in one paragraph on the 'Femmes damnées'" (p. 57, n. 1), he betrays some ignorance of Baudelaire criticism, but it is certainly true that critics have too often sheered away from the poetry itself.

The first chapters, an inadequate and occasionally inaccurate sketch of Baudelaire's life, a discussion of his dandyism and then of his Catholicism, on all of which much work has been done with which Mr. Bennett is apparently unfamiliar, are the least satisfactory part of the book. Mr. Bennett is quite right, I believe, in stressing the prime importance of the religious problem in Baudelaire's work, but he emphasizes its theological side at the expense of the intense personal and moral preoccupations which made Baudelaire a disciple of Emerson as well as of De Maistre. Incidentally, the reader is continually exasperated in these chapters by the

absence of any references for the prose quotations, all given in translation.

The significant and interesting part of the book is a direct study of Baudelaire's poetry. It is unfortunate that Mr. Bennett's opinions are so often expressed with an assurance verging on arrogance, and couched in somewhat pretentious language; the validity of his use of mathematical terms is particularly questionable. But he has read the *Fleurs du Mal* with understanding and penetration, as his excellent summary shows:

Baudelaire was the first important modern reaction against the early nineteenth century poetry. He worked his craft around the major paradox of good and evil. He revived an ironical form of treatment and a clarity of metaphor and imagery which had seldom been seen since the seventeenth century English poets. His actualization of paradox gave his work its incisive and disturbing power. His admiration for Gautier provided him with a technical discipline, a preference for tight and rigid verse form, which makes many of his poems seem like finely wrought crucibles within which a mass of molten metal is raging (p. 30).

Mr. Bennett goes on to study a number of individual poems, giving first the French text, then his own translation, then a discussion which is too often a paraphrase. The result is unfortunate; inevitably the reader feels a gradual dilution of the poetry through these stages, especially when Mr. Bennett expands some of Baudelaire's swift terse comparisons. In discussing the lines in *L'Imprévu* on Célimène's heart, "racorni, fumé comme un jambon," he cooks his ham with an abundance of culinary detail that leaves the reader with a slightly queasy feeling reminiscent of that inspired by the over-gory details of Musset's too-famous pelican.

The most flagrant, and the most inexcusable flaw in the book is the large number of errors in translation. The translations are frankly intended to help the reader's understanding of the French, and one can excuse to some extent the frequent awkwardness of style, the questionable choice of words. But there are also purely grammatical mistakes, and actual mistranslations of words. The most startling example occurs in the first *Spleen* (p. 91), where Mr. Bennett, apparently unaware of the use of *jeu* for a pack of cards, translates

Cependant qu'en un jeu plein de sales parfums,
Whilst in a sport full of filthy perfumes,

and, two lines later,

Le beau valet de cœur et la dame de pique
become

The dandy valet of the heart and the lady of pique.

In spite of mistranslations, of dangerous paraphrases, of some questionable interpretations, there are many illuminating comments

on the poems, such as those on *La servante au grand cœur* (p. 74). Personally, I should disagree with that part of Mr. Bennett's conclusion which finds "Baudelaire's asthetic and formal achievement" (p. 160) in such rigidly formal poems as *Le Balcon* and *Harmonie du soir*, and characterizes *Les Petites Vieilles* as "this rambling poem," and the end of *Le Voyage* as an "immature and fulsome manifesto." To my mind, Baudelaire's greatness lies, not in the poems which immediately became the anthology pieces of a generation enamored of Parnassian perfection, but in those, such as *Le Cygne*, in which he accomplished in verse the miracle that was his aim in the *Petits Poèmes en prose*, a style adapted "aux mouvements lyriques de l'âme, aux ondulations de la rêverie, aux soubresauts de la conscience." But this is a matter of opinion. Mr. Bennett's book, in spite of all the reservations I have made, is a step in the right direction in Baudelaire criticism, a study stemming from an immediate personal contact with Baudelaire's poetry.

MARGARET GILMAN

Bryn Mawr College

Jacques Cazotte. (1719-1792). By EDWARD PEASE SHAW. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942. Pp. x, 136.

This is a carefully documented study of one of the distinctly minor writers of the eighteenth century. The book is largely biographical, as indeed it had to be, since the literary importance of Cazotte was, and remains, slight. The reader follows him from his birth in the old Burgundian town of Dijon through his early years and his government service as *contrôleur* on the island of Martinique in the middle of the century. Cazotte returned to France in time to take a vituperative part in favor of French music as against the Italianate school of Rousseau, Grimm, and Diderot in the famous "Querelle des Bouffons" in 1753. As a middle-class conservative, Cazotte quite naturally found himself at odds on most questions with both Voltaire and Rousseau. He was very definitely *anti-philosophe*. His uncritical spirit led him also to a ready faith in the occult. For him, as for many other minds, rationalism was too strong a draught. As he smiled courageously on the guillotine, he said to the crowd: "Je meurs comme j'ai vécu, fidèle à Dieu et à mon Roi" (p. 113).

"Jacques Cazotte," says Mr. Shaw, "was not endowed with the qualities which might have given him immortality. He lacked a penetrating analysis of human nature, the elegant beauty of formal perfection, the emotional values of lyrical subjectivism, and a realistic observation of the world. . . . Although he was gifted with a natural story-telling ability, Cazotte's

besetting fault is his uncontrolled imagination. . . . Cazotte's masterpiece, *Le Diable amoureux*, was written at the most favorable time of the author's life, when fantasy had been slightly moderated by the realism of *Le Lord impromptu*, and when Martinist ideas had not sobered the piquancy of his talents. His remaining works are mediocre" (pp. 114-15).

This is surely as much as safely can be said, and Mr. Shaw has said it, calmly and judiciously.

The author notes further that Nodier and Nerval acknowledged the influence of Cazotte (p. 116). The German *conteur* of the marvelous and the fantastic, Hoffmann, gives direct evidence of having read his French predecessor (p. 66). It is probable also that the Englishman, "Monk" Lewis, was acquainted with Cazotte's *Diable amoureux* (p. 116). So this minor story-writer has his small niche, far removed from the main highways of French literature.

Mr. Shaw seems to have overstressed Cazotte's supposed goodness of character, based after all on uncritical testimony, and it is impossible not to feel at the end that Cazotte's literary talents appear even slighter, buried under the mass of his too numerous or inconsequential other activities. Fortunately, Mr. Shaw has not strained after effect or tried to blow into a major figure one who, like La Fontaine's "grenouille," could only have burst in the attempt.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

The Ohio State University

La Nativité et Le Geu des Trois Roys. By RUTH WHITTREDGE.
Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College dissertation, 1944. Pp. 217.

Back in 1837 Achille Jubinal published these two plays among the eleven dramatizing the life of Christ or the lives of saints which he entitled "Mystères inédits du quinzième siècle." Exactly one hundred years later Miss C. Sennewaldt re-edited the miracle play dealing with Sainte Geneviève, which incidentally is also the name of the library where the only extant manuscript is preserved.

This Bryn Mawr dissertation does honor both to the editor and to her teacher, the erudite Mrs. Grace Frank. Jubinal's text was not a critical edition; his introduction was not factual; he offered no glossary. Miss Whittredge has culled from her training in paleographic interpretation and from her command of hagiographical literature the knowledge needed to overcome all of his defects. The very date used in Jubinal's title is misleading. Likewise Lucien Foulet's placing of all the eleven plays in the fourteenth century was too sweeping (page 25). All aspects of Miss Whittredge's treatment converge on her assigning the first performance of these two plays to the first half of the fourteenth century and their

present redaction to the second half of the same century. The accumulated evidence points to the period between 1350 and 1420 as the date of composition for the entire series.

Apparently Miss Whittredge finished the proof-reading too early to revise two references (on pages 64 and 213): the most recent edition of the Anglo-Norman *Seinte Resurrecion*, begun by the late Professors T. A. Jenkins and J. M. Manly and completed by Miss J. G. Wright and Miss M. K. Pope, appeared at Oxford in 1943, and the most exhaustive investigation of the *estampie* genre is that of Lloyd Hibberd, *Speculum*, xix (1944), pp. 222-249. Personally I feel that the shift from English to modern French in translating the Old French glossary is highly commendable. Inasmuch as "La Nativité" and "Le Geu des trois roys" have an obvious relationship with "La Resurrection Nostre Seigneur," all three of which may well be the work of the same playwright, it is regrettable that this edition is limited to two panels of the triptych and only the Limbo scene from the third. An announcement has been made that Miss Wright and Miss Whittredge intend to re-edit two of the other dramatizations. It is to be hoped that they will then go on with the other six. They would thereby fill a lacuna in the religious drama of mediaeval France, and enable one to draw tenable conclusions as to the sources, language, versification, staging, and literary position of the entire repertory.

RAPHAEL LEVY

Louisiana State University

English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642: Being an Account of the Development of the Tragedy of the Common Man Showing its Great Dependence on Religious Morality, Illustrated with Striking Examples of the Interposition of Providence for the Amendment of Men's Manners. By HENRY HITCH ADAMS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. x + 228. \$2.50. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 159.)

Mr. Adams finds that domestic tragedy is "a tragedy of the common people, ordinarily set in the domestic scene, dealing with personal and family relationships rather than with large affairs of state, presented in a realistic fashion, and ending in a tragic or otherwise serious manner." He presents Elizabethan domestic tragedy as brought into being not so much by a growing regard for the worth of the common people as by an urge to create moral drama that would strike home with peculiar force to the bosoms of

ordinary men and women. In so doing he justifies himself. As he says when he comes to write the conclusion of his book, "Domestic tragedy had not as yet learned how to reveal the greatness of simple people. . . . It chose its heroes from common ranks of society because those persons afforded the best lessons to the men and women of similar ranks who made up the audiences. Its methods were those of the broadside ballad, the homiletic tract, and other didactic literature."

English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575 to 1642 deals with a background of popular theology concerning the punishment and forgiveness of sinners; with the introduction into *The Mirror for Magistrates* and other nondramatic literature of tragical stories about the falls of commoners; with the characteristics of domestic tragedy found in many morality plays and in several plays based on legend and history; with the murder plays of the type of *Arden of Feversham*; with Thomas Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (which gets, as it deserves, a chapter to itself); and with the decline of domestic tragedy beginning about 1607. There is a useful appendix listing a number of lost plays of which some were clearly domestic tragedies and others may have been. The book is a successful survey of a fairly wide field.

Naturally the chief matter with which Mr. Adams concerns himself is the murder plays. In them he finds a common pattern of sin, discovery, repentance, punishment, and expectation of divine mercy. He undertakes to show that "a knowledge of the popular theology of Elizabethan England is as important for an appreciation of these plays as is a familiarity with the modern capitalistic system for an insight into the drama of the last fifty years," and he emphasizes the fact that divine Providence often intervenes in them to punish vice, reward virtue, protect innocence, and aid the authorized agents of God. Among the conventions that he discovers in the murder plays are the "chain of vice," by which the protagonist goes from sin to sin, and the "scaffold speech" of repentance. There can be no question that *Arden of Feversham* and other plays of its kind demonstrate in a special way the strength of that force which impelled Elizabethan tragedy to be something other than the medieval tragedy of Fortune. With directness and simplicity—too much simplicity—they show tragic justice, instead of tragic chance, at work in the world. Sometimes Mr. Adams presses rather hard in making out the theological framework for such tragedies. This framework may not always be so complete as he thinks it is. But he reveals its importance.

Mr. Adams is certainly under no illusions as to the tragic merits of the plays that he has chosen to study. He thinks that they have dramatic merits and that as long as *Arden of Feversham*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, and *A Woman Killed with Kindness* are read critics will find in them manifold excellences. But the merits are in the

main merely those of effective realism. *Arden of Feversham* and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* introduce us to "people who, for a time, transcend their petty existences through the terrifying power of their ruling passions," and *A Woman Killed with Kindness* "makes as strong an appeal to pity as do these others to terror." Yet despite the appeals to terror and pity which he recognizes Mr. Adams decides that "in none of the Elizabethan domestic tragedies is real tragedy achieved." This judgment is based upon his conviction that real tragedy must evoke an appreciation of grandeur and tragic waste by the presentation of truly great protagonists. As he sees the heroes of the Elizabethan domestic tragedies they are dominated by jealousy, cupidity, lust, and malevolence rather than rivalry, ambition, love, and hatred. They are only miserable sinners and not to be compared with Tamburlaine, Hamlet, Lear, Macbeth, Oedipus, and Orestes. Mr. Adams sets high standards. It may be that most of the authors of Elizabethan domestic tragedies would have accepted some such standards. These authors tended to be unpresumptuous and sometimes they apologized for their homespun offerings.

WILLARD FARNHAM

University of California, Berkeley

The Dissidence of Dissent: The Monthly Repository, 1806-1838.

By FRANCIS E. MINEKA. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944. Pp. xiv + 458. \$4.00.

Only those who have attempted to discover what the *Monthly Repository* was really about can fully appreciate the minute workmanship of Francis Mineka's account, which has made available the entire course of the periodical from its brave inception as an organ of Unitarianism, 1806, to its honorable and happy death in the "editorial arms" of Leigh Hunt, 1838.

The vigor and sweep of Unitarian support of the reforms instigated by the Philosophic Radicals has not been adequately recognized partly because one of its chief instruments, the magazine which was ultimately to become powerful through the writing of W. J. Fox and John Stuart Mill, was for too long a time involved in doctrinal polemics. Mr. Mineka has helped to define the complex contentions of the *Repository* by a history and analysis of Unitarianism from Priestley to Channing, particularly its correlation with Arianism and Socinianism. Further clarification of the monthly's position is given by a closely packed and inclusive survey of English religious periodicals from 1700 to 1825, revealing the wide range of public opinion from suspect liberality to such

instances of expansive orthodoxy as the caption "On the Probable Design of Providence in Subjecting India to Great Britain."

Mr. Mineka's scholarship is at its best in delineating the life and work of the prominent Unitarian minister and forceful editor, William J. Fox, who changed the emphasis of the *Repository* from theological to economic and political issues. Not satisfied with "the narrowness of sectarian religious effort" in the face of such appalling needs as the reform of parliament, the secret ballot, the rights of women, and changes in the divorce law, the penal code, and the system of education, Fox used the magazine to widen the field of religious concern, urging that "it is chiefly in politics that we must do, not violate, our duty to our neighbour."

Mr. Mineka shows in detail how Fox's position was reinforced by the writing of Harriet Martineau and of the *Monthly's* most brilliant correspondent, John Stuart Mill. The contributions of both Mill and Fox himself are examined for their adherence to, and more especially their divergence from, Economic Radicalism, revealing among other not always congruous trends St. Simonian compassion for the oppressed, Utilitarian loyalty to the principle of laissez faire even when applied to the factory system and the poor laws, and Unitarian need for individual integrity and the right to approach all questions from the standpoint of reason and science.

Of particular interest also are the *Repository's* discussion of Milton's *Christian Doctrine* and the development under Fox of literary criticism, which reached distinction in its prompt recognition of Browning and Tennyson. The usefulness of the magazine is greatly extended by Mr. Mineka's careful identification of authorship, which he has appended together with a discriminative bibliography.

MIRIAM M. H. THRALL

Philadelphia

Carlyle: Prophet of To-Day. By FRANK A. LEA. London: Routledge, 1943.

It is difficult to fathom just why this little book was published, except that Mr. Lea evidently wanted to write a book on Carlyle. It purports to be a revaluation of Carlyle in terms of the warring ideologies of to-day, and to show, especially toward the end, that Carlyle's teachings can aid in the re-birth of religion, which alone can save Europe. Yet, while Carlyle's ideas are excellently paraphrased, and while there is occasional discussion of Nazism and Marxism, there is after all no clear-cut indication of the way in which Carlyle can be a real prophet of our times. For one thing, Mr. Lea has done himself the injustice of ignoring almost all the literature on Carlyle since, he confesses, "a great deal of this

makes very unedifying reading" (p. v). He confesses also to having drawn very little on Carlyle's letters, journals, or the *Reminiscences*. With the aid of Mr. Neff's biography of Carlyle, and with a few glances into the *Letters* and the *Reminiscences*, Mr. Lea takes Carlyle's text and expounds the Carlylean doctrine. He is excellent in his exposition of *Sartor Resartus*, extremely able on the *Cromwell* (whom most writers on Carlyle neglect), and is truly penetrating when he brings Carlyle and Marx together. But one has the feeling throughout the book that all has not been thought out clearly or fully. Mr. Lea skips too quickly over the problem of Carlyle and science; and he is not really straightforward about the blundering letter to *The Times* in 1870, when Carlyle seems, at least in this generation, to have bet on the wrong horse. And he writes rather uncomprehendingly about the might-makes-right theory, which, argue as we will, means what it says in Carlyle's text, in spite of his qualifying phrases. No matter how well Carlyle softened it with transcendentalism, it was and is, historically, a disastrous doctrine; and no one serves Carlyle well who does not face that fact honestly. Finally, Mr. Lea's attempts to link up Carlyle with Eddington, Whitehead, and "John Middleton Murry's impressive book, *God*" (pp. 28-29), and with J. C. Smuts' *Holism and Evolution* do not shed much light, since they are brief and fragmentary.

War-time conditions may account for the few errors in proof reading—*Sturm und Drang* (pp. 3, 41, 52) and *Holiness and Evolution* (p. 17). But it cannot account for exaggerative and subjective judgments, such as holding *Sartor* to be the "highest achievement of the Romantic movement in Europe" (p. 30), or the *French Revolution* to be the "greatest monument to the historical imagination in the English language" (p. 40). Mr. Lea sides wholly with Carlyle against "parliamentary democracy"; he holds that the Bellisle of Carlyle's *Frederick* was an "eighteenth-century Winston Churchill . . . incapable of seeing things as they are." Such are a few of the positions which Mr. Lea takes. His book is eminently readable and suggestive, but its arbitrary judgments remind one of what Matthew Arnold said was the eternal weakness of British criticism—caprice. On the whole, Mr. Lea's study of Carlyle must be read with considerable reserve. Often when it is most interesting it is most misleading.

CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD

The Ohio State University

BRIEF MENTION

Thomas Paine: Representative Selections, with introduction, bibliography, and notes. Edited by HARRY HAYDEN CLARK. New York: American Book Company (American Writers Series), 1944. Pp. cli + 436. The general editor of the useful American Writers Series has produced his anthology and comment upon Thomas Paine. The make-up of the book differs in no important way from that of the other members of the series except perhaps in the greater fullness of detailed comment upon the circumstances which brought each of Paine's important publications into being. This material the editor has condensed into a series of Notes, beginning on p. 409. These are minute; but as they seem to be more particularly addressed to the student using the book than to the specialist in eighteenth-century Americana, the vexed question of the authenticity of the several texts of Paine is, probably for that reason, but lightly discussed.

The front matter of the book, which runs to over a hundred pages, goes extensively into the origin and shaping of Paine's ideas. The discussion is clear, if redundant; the editor is so filled with enthusiasm for his subject that he has furnished a superfluity of information about a writer, whose persuasive powers were great, but whose mental acumen was not much above the ordinary. It is at least to be doubted, for example, when Paine writes that "Aristides, Epaminnondas, Pericles, Scipio, Camillus, and a thousand other Grecian and Roman heroes" were famous because they lived under republican governments, that this, or like citations, can be taken very seriously as evidence of the "influence of classical antiquity" upon the "thought" of the controversialist. However, every man is better for intellectual enthusiasms, and Professor Clark's enthusiasm for Paine has long been known. It has produced a book useful for giving us a good sense of Paine's interests and a very real sense of the intellectual climate in which he lived.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

Harvard University

French Learned Journals. A letter of Feb. 3 from Raymond Lebègue, now professor at the Sorbonne, informs me that the *Revue historique* and the *Revue archéologique* continued publication throughout the occupation; that *RHL* for 1940 has been printed and will be published shortly; that the *Bulletin de la Société des historiens du théâtre* was published by Mlle Droz in 1943 under the title of *Travaux 1940-41*; and that *Humanisme et Renaissance*, which had ceased publication with Vol. VII (1940), reappeared in 1941 as *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance* and will have completed its seventh volume by the end of the present year.—H. C. L.

CORRESPONDENCE

TENNYSON AND PERSIAN POETRY ONCE MORE. Several years ago, in this periodical, Mr. J. D. Yohannan asserted that Tennyson's poetry had been visibly affected by the poet's knowledge of Persian; and I took it upon myself to deny the thesis.¹ Yohannan's most striking bit of evidence was a lyric written in a form suggesting that of the Persian ode, or *ghazal*, which he believed that Tennyson had inserted in the *Princess* in the edition of 1850. As a matter of fact, the lyric had appeared in the first edition, of 1847. Though I protested that the verses seemed to have been modelled by Tennyson upon the experimental forms, reminiscent of the *ghazal*, in the *West-oestliche Diwan*, I could not deny the possibility that Tennyson had learned the form of the Persian ode at first hand from E. B. Cowell "in 1846"—as Cowell recalled, in a letter of 1898—"when I spent a few days in London and went with Ed. FitzGerald to see him in his bachelor lodgings." Cowell remembered that at the time he had made an interlinear translation of an ode by Hafiz, and that Tennyson had been pleased with the Persian poetry, daunted by the Persian characters.

I am now able to dispose of the possibility. The first meeting of Cowell and Tennyson took place late in 1848—not, as Cowell said, in 1846; it took place about a year after the *Princess*, and Tennyson's semi-Persian lyric, had been published. For in a letter which can be dated by its contents as of October, or November, 1848, FitzGerald wrote to Cowell:

A. Tennyson is now residing in London, at 25 Mornington Place, Hampstead Road, a short walk from me. I particularize all this because, should you come to London, you can call upon him without further introduction. I have often spoken about you to him, and he will be very glad to make your acquaintance. Can you not run up here for a day or two before I leave?²

There can be no question that, when this letter was written, Cowell and Tennyson had not met. When Tennyson had written the lyric in the *Princess*, he had had no first hand acquaintance with the Persian ode. In view of his habits, one may surmise that he had admired the lyrics written by Goethe, and had looked up the matter in his old and trusted guide to information about the Orient—the stately *Works* of Sir William Jones.³

W. D. PADEN

University of Kansas

¹ *MLN.*, LVII (1942), 83-92; LVIII (1943), 652-6.

² *Letters and Literary Remains of Edward FitzGerald* (1902-3), I, 275.

³ In the edition of 1799 (6 vol.) there are four accounts, slightly varied but all rather vague, of the *ghazal*: II, 235-7, 327, 404; v, 436. The third mentions that seven couplets formed the minimum of an ode: Tennyson wrote a lyric in fourteen lines. For an account of the imagery habitual to Persian poets, which applies with startling strictness to that in Tennyson's lyric, see v, 442.

ANGLO-LATIN *Buzones*. This word, which occurs in Bracton's *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliae* in the meaning 'county knights on whose nod (*nodus*) depends the action of the others in the county court' has been explained by Mr. J. C. Russell (*Studies in Philology*, XLII, 18) as an English-Latin hybrid, representing a Latinization either of *busy* or of *buzz* 'to whisper, to incite by suggestion.' Apart from the fact that ME *busi bisi*, if Latinized, should rather appear in a form such as **buziones*, the very hesitation of Mr. Russell between two etyma so different from each other, invalidates his explanation: *one clear picture* must have been at the bottom of the word. There is too much reliance on a fortuitous convergency in Mr. Russell's words: "'Incite by suggestion' so neatly described their [the *buzones*] activity that one rather favors that derivation, but these men were certainly busy as well."

Mr. Russell has rightly felt that underlying this formation there must be a word with a popular ring; his preference is for the connection with 'to buzz.' But it may be asked whether a Latinization of a popular OF word is not more likely, since Gallicisms in the juridical sphere predominate in Middle English (cf. *culprit* etc.¹); if we can find an existing OF word that could have been easily Latinized into *buzones*, such an etymon would, I feel, be preferable to one involving the adaptation, with more or less difficulty, of an English word to a Latin pattern; the parallels quoted by Mr. Russell, such as *aldermannus*, *utlagatus*, *bordarius* etc. are simple adaptations to current Latin morphological patterns: in his list there is no parallel case of the addition of a Latin suffix denoting a judgment of value, such as would be implied by -ō, -ōnis (*bordarius* is the tenant of a *borda* 'house').

I would suggest as the etymon of *buzones* the OF *bu[i]son* 'buzzard' (< Lt. *buteo*, FEW), from which mod. Fr. *buse* is a regressive formation. Tilander, when speaking of the derivative OF *buisnard* 'stupid' (**buisnard*) makes the following observations on the bird of prey (*Remarques sur le Roman de Renart*, Goteborg, 1923):

Le busard a toujours passé pour être un oiseau stupide grâce à l'impossibilité de le dresser pour la fauconnerie . . . , et grâce à son habitude de rester pendant des heures à guetter sa proie [italics mine], Brehm: Tierleben, Band 3, Leipzig 1892, p. 303. 308. 311. Par opposition à l'épervier qui est un oiseau alerte et intelligent, l'on disait: 'Ja de ni de busart n'istra esprevier' . . . 'A poines fait on de bouson faucon' . . . Du même radical dérive aussi *abuisoner* 'tromper, induire en erreur' . . . Après cette excursion personne n'hésitera à rapprocher du même groupe de mots le vb. dialectal *buser*, comme l'a du reste déjà fait Escallier: Rem[arques] sur le patois etc. [1856] . . . : "Busier, pour réflechir, penser longuement et stérilement, est un verbe de notre patois [the Picardian dialect] emprunté aux oiseleurs. Il se dit par comparaison avec l'attitude et l'air stupide d'une sorte d'oiseau de proie appelé *buse* . . . Froissart pour rêver, penser, réflechir, dans le sens de notre *busier* dit *busner*: . . . Il commença moult fort à penser et à *busner* sur les nouvelles." Ce qui est curieux, c'est cependant que Escallier met *busner* en rapport avec l'angl.

¹ Cf. the Latinization of legal words of OF origin in Bracton: *roberia*, *attachiare*, *feoffamentum*, *maritagium*, *de defaltis* etc.

business. Si, d'un côté, *busier* répond à un type **buteare*, *busner*, de son côté, rend raison d'un **buteonare*, formé sur le cas régime . . . Les patois connaissent plusieurs dérivés du vb. *busier*: . . . *busoquer* 's'occuper de choses futilles, perdre son temps' . . . God. [efroy] sous *busier*: *busiller* et *businer* . . .

The FEW testifies to the vitality of *buisson*, *buissonner* in modern French patois; the metaphorical meanings, derived from the name of the buzzard, are generally 'qui est lourd d'esprit et très lent dans ses mouvements,' 'musard, qui regarde l'ouvrage, qui tourne autour avant d'y toucher,' 'qui perd son temps en bavardage ou amusement puérils,' 'nonchalant,' 'lambin,' 'éperdu, ébloui,' 'brusque, emporté'—unfortunately there is no evidence of a restriction to the idea of men engrossed in a particular occupation. Since, however, the bird in question has the habit of sitting for hours quietly with eyes fixed on his prey, why should not the people, generally inclined to consider themselves victims of the law, apply the epithet 'buzzards' to the group of men sitting quietly in the court, observing the delinquents, immersed in ominous meditation—finally to indicate their opinion by a nod of the head? In the development from 'buzzard' to 'stupid' we see one possibility (which exists also in Eng. *buzzard* 'buzzardlike, senseless, stupid'), in that from 'buzzard' to 'a man who quietly and ominously muses' we have another; our *buzones* must obviously originate from the second. Such popular metaphors can, on occasion, come into existence wherever the bird is known but, because of their popular character, they will not often appear in literature: our *buzones* 'buzzards,' 'men who behave like buzzards at the courts' could easily be an isolated attestation of an OF popular usage. After all, we can find an isolated attestation, in Fagniez, *Documents relatifs à l'histoire de l'industrie et du commerce en France II*, 77, of *busons* in the phrase *a regretiers* [= *regattiers*] *et a busons* (Troyes, c. 1339), in which *busons* must mean 'peddlars' (a meaning derived from 'to busy oneself with useless things') and is somewhat comparable to Sp. *buhón* 'peddler' (from *bufo* 'owl,' REW 1352): here, too, the attestation of the metaphoric use of the bird's name for a particular group of persons whose behavior offered an aspect similar to that of the bird, is confined to a hapax.

LEO SPITZER

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received.]

Colum, Mary M.—From these roots, the ideas that have made modern literature. New York: Columbia U. Press, 1944. Pp. xiii + 386. \$2.50. [First published in 1937.]

English Association, The.—Essays and studies. XXIX, 1943, coll. by Una Ellis-Fermor. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press]. Pp. 100. 7 sh. 6 d.

Mills, Laurens J.—Peter Hausted, playwright, poet, and preacher. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana Univ., 1944. Pp. 63. \$1.00. (Indiana U. Publications, Humanities Series, 12.)

Pope, Alexander.—*The Dunciad*, ed. by James Sutherland. London: Methuen, 1943. Pp. lvi + 476. (Twickenham ed. of Pope, John Butt, Gen. Ed., Vol. V.) 30 sh.

Sensabaugh, G. F.—The tragic muse of John Ford. Stanford Univ.: Stanford U. Press, 1944. Pp. ix + 190. \$2.00.

Shelley, Mary W.—The letters of, ed. by Frederick L. Jones. Norman, Okla.: U. of Okla. Press, 1944. 2 Vols.: Pp. xxxii + 379, xx + 390. \$12.00.

Utley, Francis Lee.—The crooked rib: an analytical index to the argument about women in English and Scots literature to the end of the year 1568. Columbus: Ohio State U., 1944. Pp. xviii + 368. \$4.00.

Wise, Thomas J.—Letters of, to John Henry Wrenn: a further inquiry into the guilt of certain nineteenth-century forgers. Ed. by Fannie E. Ratchford. New York: Knopf, 1944. Pp. xiv + 591 + xvi. \$7.50.

GERMAN

Bohning, Elizabeth Edrop.—The Concept 'Sage' in Nibelungen Criticism. The History of the Conception of 'Sage' in the Nibelungen Criticism from Lachmann to Heusler. Diss. Bryn Mawr. Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publ. Co., 1944. 254 pp.

Bräm, E. Max.—Rudolf von Tavels Werk als Ausdruck schweizerischen Denkens und Empfindens. Eine Einführung in Tavels Gedankenwelt. Bern: A. Francke [1944]. 110 pp. Fr. 3.50.

Heusler, Andreas.—Kleine Schriften. Hrsg. von H. Reuschel. 1. 2. Lfg. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1942, 1943. iv + iv + iv + iv + ii + 690 pp. Fr. 52.

Rilke et la France, textes et poèmes inédits de Rainer Maria Rilke. Essais et

souvenirs de Edmond Jaloux, Paul Valéry, André Gide, Romain Rolland, etc. Paris: Plon, 1942. 294 pp.

✓ Stahl, E. L.—Hölderlin's Symbolism. An Essay. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell [1944]. 54 pp. 3/-.

✓ Stansfield, Agnes.—Hölderlin. Manchester Univ. Press, 1944. 130 pp. 7/6d.

FRENCH

Cailliet, Emile.—Pascal. Genius in the Light of Scripture. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press (1945). 383 pp. \$3.75.

Eigeldinger, Marc.—Le dynamisme de l'image dans la poésie française. Neuchâtel: Eds. de la Baconnière, 1943. iv + 300 pp.

Gide, A. P. G.—Imaginary Interviews, tr. by Malcolm Cowley. New York: Knopf, 1944. xvii + 172 pp. \$2.00.

Picard, Roger.—La Démocratie française. Hier—Aujourd'hui—Demain. New York: Brentano's, 1944. 79 pp.

Rabelais.—Complete Works, tr. of Jacques Le Clercq. New York: Modern Lib., 1944. xxxii + 841 pp. \$1.45.

Radine, Serge.—Essais sur le théâtre, 1919-39. Geneva: Annemasse, 1944. iv + 287 pp.

Rousseaux, André.—Le prophète Pégu, 2^{me} et 3^{me} parties. Neuchâtel: Eds. de la Baconnière, 1944. iv + 238 pp.

Thorp, J. B. and E. La Velle.—La France en Amérique à l'école. New York: Holt, 1944. ix + 120 + 107 pp. \$1.28.

SPANISH

Aguilera, S. y L. Rottin.—Antología sintética de poetas argentinos contemporáneos (1912-42). Buenos Aires: Virtus, 1942. 236 pp.

Arriola Grande, F. M.—Aspectos de la lit. americana. Lima: 1942. 75 pp.

Astrana Marín, Luis.—Cervantinas y otros ensayos. Madrid: Afrodísio Aguado, 1944. 460 pp.

Bandy, O. S. and L. Avilés Pérez.—Adventures in Conversational Spanish. Atlanta: T. E. Smith, 1942. 207 pp.

Blomberg, H. P.—Mitre poeta. Buenos Aires: Edit. Coni, 1941. 65 pp.

Brett, L. E. and H. Kurz.—Intermediate Spanish Grammar and Readings. New York: Appleton-Century, 1942. 524 pp.

Casares, Julio.—El idioma como instrumento y el diccionario como símbolo. Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos exteriores, 1944. 86 pp.

Cortázar, A. R.—Guía bibliog. del folklore argentino. Buenos Aires: Universidad, 1942. 291 pp.

- Delgado, Rafael.**—Cuentos, ed. F. Monterde. Mexico: Univ. Nac. Autónoma, 1942. xxi + 204 pp.
- Díaz Mantilla.**—Antología tachirense. Caracas: La Nación, 1942. 66 pp.
- Duarte French, A.**—Guillermo Valencia. Bogotá: Edit. Jotade, 1941. 241 pp.
- Forner, J. P.**—Exequias de la lengua castellana. Buenos Aires: Edit. Poseidón, 1944. 158 pp.
- Fusco Sansone, N.**—Antología y crítica de lit. uruguaya. Montevideo: Claudio García, 1940. 487 pp.
- Gallegos, Rómulo.**—Doña Bárbara, ed. Lowell Dunham. New York: Crofts, 1942. xx + 280 pp. \$1.75.
- Galloway, C. H.**—Spanish proverbs, sayings, idioms and random selections, with Eng. trans. New York: 319 W. 18th St., 1944. v + 223 pp. \$1.50.
- Gerbasi, V.**—Creación y símbolo. Caracas: Eds. Viernes, 1942. 99 pp.
- Granier, J. A.**—Latin American belles-lettres in Eng. trans. Washington: Libr. of Congress, 1942. 31 pp.
- Greenfield, E. V.**—An Outline of Spanish Grammar. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1942. 236 pp.
- Heredia, José María.**—Poesías completas, ed. Roig de Leuchsenring. 2 vol. Havana: Municipio de la Habana, 1940-1. 295 + 463 pp.
- Júlio, S.**—Escritores da Colombia e Venezuela. Rio de Janeiro: Acad. de Letras do Brasil, 1942. 211 pp.
- Leavitt and Stoudemire.**—Concise Spanish Grammar. New York: Holt, 1942. viii + 167 + xxxiv pp.
- Leo, U.**—Estudios filológicos sobre letras venezolanas. Caracas: Ed. Elite, 1942. 75 pp.
- López Velarde, R.**—El león y la Virgen, ed. Xavier Villaurrutia. Mexico: Univ. Nac. Autónoma, 1942. xxxiii + 158 pp.
- Martel, J. and S. J. Steiner.**—Functional Spanish. New York: Vanni, 1944. 320 pp. \$2.95.
- Menéndez Plancarte, G.**—Humanistas del siglo XVIII. Mexico: Univ. Nac. Autónoma, 1941. xxx + 200 pp.
- Monterde, F.**—Augustín F. Cuenca. El prosista. El poeta de transición. Mexico: 1942. v + 140 pp.
- Monterde, Francisco.**—Fábulas sin moraleja y finales de cuentos, ed. A. Reyes. Mexico: Imp. Universitaria, 1942. xxx + 160 pp.
- Perdomo, J. E.**—Léxico tabacalero cubano. Havana: 1940. xii + 163 pp.
- Piedra-Bueno, A. de.**—Evocación de Byrne y Martí americanista. Havana: Inst. Inclán, 1942. 74 pp.
- Quiroz, A.**—Nociones de estética cinematográfica. Mexico: Nava, 1942. 138 pp.
- Sánchez, J. and S. Baig.**—Scientific and Technical Dictionaries of the Sp. and Eng. Langs., ed. K. Brown. New York: N. Y. Pub. Library, 1944. 22 pp. \$0.25.
- Silva, José Asunción.**—Poésias, ed. J. L. Arango. Bogotá: Ed. de la Revista Univ. Católica Bolivariana, 1942.
- Stover, F. P.**—Encanto de México. New York: Macmillan, 1942. ix + 103 pp.
- Tagle, J. G.**—Los culteranos en el Perú. Lima: Gil, 1942. 29 pp.
- Tyre, C. A. and A. B.**—Speaking Spanish; a conversational guide. New York: Holt, 1944. ix + 217 + cxxiii pp. \$1.75.
- Vallejo, César.**—Antología, ed. Xavier Abril. Buenos Aires: Claridad, 1942. 175 pp.
- Vela, D.**—Literatura guatimalteca. Guatemala City: Tip. Nacional, 1943.
- Villa Fernández, P.**—Latino-américa: relación de historia. New York: Holt, 1942. \$1.00.
- Walsh, D. D.**—Cuentos y versos americanos. New York: Norton, 1942. 192 pp.
- Washington Bermúdez, S.**—El lexicógrafo rioplatense. Montevideo: 1941. 38 pp.
- Whitmore, K. R.**—Handbook for Intermediate Spanish. New York: Norton, 1942. 228 pp.
- Yépez Miranda, A.**—Pasado y presente de las letras peruanas. Cuzco: Rozas Sucesores, 1942. 149 pp.

PORtUGUESE

- Abreu, Casimiro de.**—Obras. Ed. Sousa da Silveira. Rio de Janeiro: Edit. Nacional, 1940. 456 pp.
- Amado, Jorge.**—Vida de Luis Carlos Prestas, el caballero de la esperanza. Buenos Aires: Edit. Claridad, 1942. 400 pp.
- Garham, D. R.**—Folkways of Brazil; a bibliog., ed. Karl Brown. New York: N. Y. Public Libr., 1944. vi + 67 pp. \$1.25.
- Lanteuil, H. de.**—La poésie brésilienne, 1930-40. Rio de Janeiro: Alba Edit., 1941. vii + 295 pp.
- Liberato Bittencourt.**—Nova historia da lit. brasileira. Vol. I. Rio de Janeiro: Graf. Ginásio, 1942. 587 pp.
- Machado de Assis.**—Memorias posthumas de Braz Cubas. Rio de Janeiro: Jackson, 1940. 407 pp.
- Vocabulário do estado do Rio Grande do Sul.** Porto Alegre: Livr. do Globo, 1940. 497 pp.
- Williams, E. B.**—An Introductory Portuguese Grammar. New York: Crofts, 1942. \$1.90.

1945

iemato-
p.
fic and
d Eng.
N. Y.

L. J. L.
Univ.

. New
p.
l Perú.

spanish;
: Holt,

Xavier
175 pp.
alteca.

nérica:
, 1942.

cianos.

ógrafo
o.

Inter-
, 1942.

ente de
esores,

usa da
cional,

Carlos
Buenos

azil; a
N. Y.
5.
lienne,
1841.

ria da
: Graf

humas
ackson,

nde do
1940.

Portu-
1942.

45

—

to-

nd

ng.

Y.

L.

iv.

ew

rú.

sh;

olt,

ier

pp.

eca.

ca:

942.

los.

rafo

ter.

942.

e de

ores,

—

a da

onal,

—

arlos

enos

—

l; a

Y. Y.

—

enne,

1941.

—

a da

Graf

—

umas

kson,

—

le do

1940.

—

ortu-

1942.

—

45
—
to-
nd
ng.
Y.

L.
iv.

ew

rú.

sh;
olt;

ier
pp.
eca.

ca:
942.

nos.

rafo

ter-
942.

e de
res,

a da
onal,

rlos
enos

l; a
Y. X.

enne,
941.

a da
Graf

umas
kson,

le do
1940.

ortu-
1942.

PERFECT YOUR FRENCH... FOR POST-WAR NEEDS

at McGill University
FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL
June 28—August 10, 1945

The McGill French Summer School is a long established and popular School. It provides carefully graded instruction for those who wish to improve their command of spoken and written French and at the same time offers a wide range of cultural courses, some of which lead to the M. A. degree at McGill or elsewhere. All courses in intermediate and advanced sections are of University standard. Certificates show equivalent semester hours for university credit.

Students are advised to stay in University residence with French staff. French alone spoken at all times. Conversation and practical work with the language in a natural French atmosphere. Resident scholarships for meritorious students.

Fee (tuition, board and room) \$190.00 (Canadian). U. S. currency is now at a premium.



Write now for prospectus, to:

DIRECTOR, French Summer School,
McGill University — Montreal, Canada.

TRACTS AND PAMPHLETS

by RICHARD STEELE

EDITED WITH NOTES AND COMMENTARY BY RAE BLANCHARD

The reputation of Sir Richard Steele as a man of letters is secure in his essays and plays, and as promoter and editor of the influential *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and *Guardian*, his contribution to English social development is admittedly great. But his achievement in public life is commonly underrated, and one aspect of his journalism, his work as publicist and pamphleteer during the crucial years of the early eighteenth century, all but forgotten. For one reason his pamphlets are difficult of access. Although there were reissues of several at the close of the century, they are now rare in these as well as the earlier forms, and there has been no modern edition. For the first time, here in one volume are gathered together the thirty—or so—pieces constituting his known writings as a pamphleteer. In this collected edition, each one is accompanied by an introductory note outlining the occasion, a separate bibliography describing the various editions and translations, and a statement of the variant readings in the text.

It is in these tracts and pamphlets that the integrity of Steele's public life becomes clear. Touching as they do upon all important issues then before the English public, they are nevertheless unified by his passionate adherence to the principles of the Revolution of 1688—constitutional monarchy, religious toleration, personal and parliamentary liberty.

xvii + 663 pages, 29 facsimiles. Octavo. \$3.30.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18

A Good Augury

Since 1941 the number of students in our high schools and colleges studying Portuguese has increased at least 500%. This indicates that we realize the importance of friendly relations with Brazil and augurs well for our future national defense.

HILLS, FORD, COUTINHO & MOFFATT'S Portuguese Grammar, Revised

Stresses spoken Portuguese and Brazilian usage; gives thorough training in grammar; conveys important information about Brazil and the life of its people; teaches Portuguese letter-writing. Illustrated. \$2.52

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

QUINCE CENTAVOS

[*Un día de vida
en Buenos Aires*]

By JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ OROZCO Edited by HARRY KURZ

Something really new in textbooks: a drama of a single day in the life of an Argentine family, written by a brilliant dramatist specifically for American students. To be published in April.



HOLT

257 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 10, NEW YORK